

The
Catholic Biblical Quarterly

Volume I, Number I

January, 1939

Published by
**THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.**

EDITORIAL STAFF

Rev. Wendell S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., SS.S.D., *Chief Editor*
St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md.

Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., M.A., S.T.D.
Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.

Reverend Edward Donzé, S.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.
Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

Rev. John Rowen, S.T.D., S.S.L.
St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa.

Rev. Charles Pickar, O.S.A., S.T.L., S.S.L.
Augustinian College, Washington, D. C.

Rev. Cyril Gaul, O.S.B., *Publishing Editor*
St. Meinrad Seminary, S. Meinrad, Ind.

The CATHOLIC BIBLICAL QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October, by the Catholic Biblical Association, Cum Permissu Superiorum.

The subscription price is \$5.00 a year. Members of the Catholic Biblical Association receive the CATHOLIC BIBLICAL QUARTERLY gratis.

Address all communications to
THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION
Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.



DAL VATICANO, August 22nd, 1938

N° 170462

DA CITARSI NELLA RISPOSTA

Reverend Doctor William Newton,

The Holy Father has received the specially bound copy of "Proceedings of the Catholic Biblical Association of America" and has commissioned me to extend His sincere thanks for this scholarly expression of filial devotion.

Surely the work of the Biblical Association in America is dear to the heart of the Supreme Pontiff, so that when He bestows upon its members a Special Apostolic Blessing, you may be assured that He is not only thanking God for the graces and favours thus far received, but most especially imploring that the Holy Ghost will descend to enlighten the minds and enlarge love in the hearts of those whose honor and privilege it is to investigate and propagate the Holy Word of God.

The Holy Father is looking forward with Paternal interest to the publication of the first objectives of the Biblical Association.

Having spoken for the Sovereign Pontiff, may I add my own congratulations and feelings of esteem.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

E. Card. Tacchini

Rev. Doctor William Newton
Catholic University America
Washington, D.-C.

CONTENTS

Editorial Notes	5
<i>Rev. W. S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D.</i>	
President's Address	9
<i>Rev. W. Newton, M.A., S.S.D.</i>	
The Essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass and Scripture	15
<i>Rev. John McHugh, O.P., S.T.M., Litt. D.</i>	
The Seventy Weeks	44
<i>Rev. Michael J. Gruenthaner, S.J., S.T.D., S.S.D.</i>	
The Synoptic Problem	55
<i>Rev. Charles Callan, O. P., S.T.M., Litt. D.</i>	
Our Lord and the Pharisees	64
<i>Rev. W. S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D.</i>	
Obscurities in the Latin Psalter	69
<i>Rev. William McClellan, S.J., S.T.D.</i>	
The Hartford Meeting	75
Biblical News	80
Book Reviews	86
<i>The New Testament, F. A. Spencer, O.P. EDWARD J. BYRNE</i>	
<i>Christ the Leader, Rev. W. R. Russel. J. L. BAZINET</i>	
<i>The New Testament, Cambridge Summer School. W. L. NEWTON</i>	
<i>An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament,</i> <i>Leo Gaganay. JOHN J. COLLINS, S.J.</i>	
<i>Watch and Pray and Isaias: Man of Ideas, Dom Hubert Van</i> <i>Zeller. EDWARD J. BYRNE.</i>	

EDITORIAL NOTES

PURPOSE

Why a Catholic Biblical Quarterly? First of all, because the Catholic Biblical Association of America needs an organ. Its members have listened to very many carefully prepared papers and they would like to go over them at leisure and doubtless many others would like to read them. Many of these works seem really important. Thus we shall publish one of the most thorough studies ever written on the *Essence of the Mass and Scripture*. It is not controversial; it states objectively the biblical idea of sacrifice and looks as if it might bring together those who have been advocating the oblation theory and those who defend the theory of immolation. There was, too, the communication of a young Jesuit Doctor of Sacred Scripture on the Seventy Weeks of Daniel; it should be of interest to our professors of theology as well as to those who have specialized in the Bible. These and other papers made us realize that we have on hand matter enough for the first numbers of a review; and the men to produce other able and interesting articles. In fact, when the question of a review was broached no one seemed to doubt that we could turn out a quarterly which would be useful to the members of the Association and to many other readers. The only point discussed was whether we could afford it. But during the last few years the treasurer has been taking in membership dues at \$5.00 a year, and a number of bishops (including two Cardinals) have made themselves our patrons and given contributions. The Rev. Dr. Steinmuller of Brooklyn Seminary, our efficient and careful treasurer, was found to have enough money to pay the expenses of the first year. So there was no unreasonable risk in going ahead and giving a fit medium for self-expression to the eager, hard-working men, old and young, who had proved their desire to teach and to learn by coming from great distances to take part in the activities of the C. B. A. of America.

The Quarterly aims to make itself useful not only by encouraging our Biblical scholars to write and discuss subjects which are of interest to themselves, but to make them useful to those students of the Bible who are not enclosed by the walls of seminaries and scholasticates. We had been having our meetings in conjunction with the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and we

realized in presence of so many who were trying to understand the Bible and to teach at least a part of it, that we could easily help them by expository articles bringing out the meaning of the sacred text and other articles dealing with the problems they meet. Among these teachers, priests come first. All difficulties of study clubs are referred ultimately to them. One of our strongest desires is to help those whom we have taught in the seminary to carry on their Biblical studies and to teach the Bible in the pulpit, in study clubs, and in the lecture hall.

In the meetings hitherto held concerning the revision of the Douay Bible and in those devoted to the reading and discussion of papers there has not been any dissension whatsoever. The greatest harmony has been a noticeable feature in these gatherings of secular priests and members of religious orders. They seem to be of one mind and heart. All are as one might expect, agreed on the inerrancy of the Bible and seem to share the same principles of interpretation. There must arise some differences of opinion; but to judge from our past discussions there will be perfect liberty in handling subjects in which doubts and divisions of opinion are allowable. Of course, we all see in the Church the divinely appointed defender and interpreter of the Bible and we shall be guided by her directions and by her mind.

Ours will be the only Catholic review devoted exclusively to the Bible in the English-speaking world. We shall look for light in works published in other languages and even in non-Catholic publications. We shall try not to be controversial, but to seek and communicate the truth in a peaceable way. But there is a great need that those who believe in the Bible should speak out for the faith and hope that is in them and exercise some control over the statements and assumptions of those non-Catholics whose first principles exclude the supernatural. To judge from the experience of those who are teaching from Evidence-pitches, there are, too, still many old-fashioned Protestants in English-speaking countries who want information on matters discussed ever since the time of Luther, for instance, on what St. Paul meant by faith and justification. We shall gladly answer questions sent to us by priests and other teachers.

* * *

In a recent number of the Catholic World, Mr. Joseph Reilly quotes Agnes Repplier as saying, "History cannot accommodate itself unreservedly to theories; it cannot be stripped of things

evidenced, in favor of things surmised." One of the things evidenced which is being lost sight of in the dust of theories and surmises is the fact that our gospels have as their authors Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. We think it worth while to restate our evidence, and keep it in the mind of those who are ever evolving new theories about the origin of our gospels.

All the questions about the origin of our gospels have not been answered however. The late Dom John Chapman, O.S.B., Abbot of Downside, a most fascinating and ingenious writer, left notes about Matthew, Mark, and Luke which are reviewed in this number by the Very Rev. Charles J. Callan, O.P., S.T.M. The Abbot's most startling theory is contained in his first chapter. He here maintains that our second gospel, St. Mark, a gospel which Father Kleist, S. J., after St. Justin, calls "The Memoirs of St. Peter," depends on the gospel of St. Matthew in its Greek form, such as it is in our Bibles. He claims to give evidence for this extraordinary view. We were afraid for a moment that Father Callan had been seduced by the brilliant Abbot of Downside. We read in his manuscript that the author had discovered passages where St. Mark had *clearly passed over or summarized* large portions of the Greek Matthew; but reading on we found that our reviewer did not really see any evidence for such a strange theory. Trembling, we took our editorial pen in hand to change "clearly passed over and summarized" to "seemed to pass over and summarize."

Dom Chapman thought that St. Peter in Rome carried about St. Matthew's Greek Gospel and used it as a sort of textbook. He loaned it occasionally to St. Mark, and St. Mark copied part of it and enriched its story with new details he had heard from St. Peter when the Prince of the Apostles was expounding St. Matthew. But if St. Mark had the Greek Matthew before him why did he write at all? Nearly everything he had to say was already in his predecessor and expressed in much better Greek than he could command. The details which he added to the sections borrowed would indeed be interesting since they add precious light to what St. Matthew tells of things concerning Jesus; but they do not seem to have been much appreciated in antiquity. After the appearance of the longer and better written gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke that of St. Mark was little used.

Father Callan surprises us when he speaks tolerantly of the view of his Dominican confrère, Father Vosté, professor at the

Angelico in Rome, that St. Mark had the Aramaic gospel of St. Matthew before him when he wrote. Now tradition and the Biblical Commission tell us that the Aramaic Matthew was substantially the same as the Greek Matthew. If St. Mark knew this gospel why did he not make better use of it? How account for his omissions of the Gospel of the Infancy, of the Sermon on the Mount, etc. No theory can account for such strange omissions. But we are not confined to theories and surmises.

Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis in the first part of the second century, gives evidence. It may be worth while to quote him in the version of Father Kleist (*Memoirs of St. Peter*, p. 22) :

This, too, the Old Man said: "Mark, who was Peter's interpreter, committed to writing—accurately, but *not with full detail*—all that he remembered of the words and works of the Lord; for he had never heard or followed the Lord, but subsequently followed Peter, as I said. Now, Peter used to deliver his instructions according to requirements, but not as one who gives a complete exposition of the Lord's activity. Therefore Mark was not guilty of blunder if he wrote—to the best of his recollection—but *an incomplete account*. For of one matter he took forethought not to omit anything he had heard nor to falsify in recording anything."

The Old Man, Dom Chapman has shown better than anyone else (*John the Presbyter*), is none other than St. John the Evangelist, the Son of Zebedee.

Part of our review will be for personal edification of priests. For instance, Father McClellan, S. J., proposes to write a section on the "Obscurities of the Psalter." This well known and much loved Jesuit Father has been expounding the Old Testament to Jesuit scholastics at Woodstock College for a very long time. He is one of the editorial board of the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, and besides the work he has already undertaken he is willing, during three years, to answer the questions so many priests keep putting to teachers, "What does this text of the psalm mean?" Those who have followed Father McClellan's reviews of O. T. literature in the *Ecclesiastical Review* will realize immediately how valuable his contribution will be.

The Rev. Edward A. Cerny, S.S., D.D., has brought back from Palestine a great interest in archaeology and has kindly undertaken to furnish an account of recent excavations in Bible lands and their results. This news of the biblical world, and other information about what is going on in biblical schools and in the study of biblical scholars will be welcomed by the *Quarterly*.

W. S. R.

NIL ACTUM SI QUID AGENDUM

The circumstances of this meeting, the second general gathering of our members, warrants my asking that you absolve me from the obligation of presenting a carefully studied paper or the fruits of research in one of the biblical sciences. Other thoughts of a pragmatic character are now forced upon our attention; and though these be rather obvious they call for expression that may be written into our records.

One thought is indeed in the minds of all: the satisfying contemplation of the progress made by our young Association. It is now but two years since it was proposed to the Catholic biblical scholars of this country and Canada. In this time we have seen it spring from an ideal, a creature of vision, into a well founded reality. We have watched it win the enthusiastic support of almost every Catholic professor of Scripture in America. With great encouragement we have witnessed our Hierarchy adding their names to its rolls and lending it their support. Its constitution has been thoroughly discussed and approved. Beyond the confines of our own land, it has been brought to the attention of the authorities at Rome and to that of the biblical scholars of other English-speaking countries, receiving from the one hearty approbation and blessing, and from the other recognition as the symbol of a new day in Catholic biblical studies.

Although this prospect justifies a sense of accomplishment, other thoughts at once crowd into the consideration and give pause to our sentiments. What we see before us as the task we have undertaken should prevent a complacency that might otherwise lull us into an inactivity destructive of the very ends for which we exist. We may have some pride in the fact that ours is a *biblical* association, one, therefore, that deals with a most exalted subject; we may also permit some satisfaction with the soundness that seems to qualify our organization. But when we turn from this introspection to view the field in which our labours will be found, we must realize that only in diligent and persevering effort may we hope for that success which justifies complacency.

The warning to our Association which may be discovered in this consideration was given incisive expression a few months ago by the present Holy Father, Pope Pius XI. Speaking to an assembly of biblical students, he advised against the enervating

thought that we have finished our work or reached a period of rest in the matter of the Sacred Writings. He gathered the details of this counsel under the motto: *Nil actum si quid agendum*. And we to whom the warning reaches with all its force might well make it the subject of serious reflection, for it is both a warning and a call to our Biblical Association, pointing to the work which confronts us and defining the spirit with which we should enter upon it.

The significance of the motto and its pertinence to our present situation become at once clear from even a general view of the current position of the Bible and of biblical studies.

There prevails, as we know, a lamentable and growing disregard of the Bible in our generation. Were this found only in the people, we might be inclined to look for excuse to the disturbed conditions of the times. But when we discover it embodied in a statement of doctrine emanating from what is usually a conservative religious body we are inclined to look upon it as a portent. In reference to the inspiration of the Scriptures this statement proclaims that "The tradition of the inerrancy of the Bible commonly held in the Church until the beginning of the nineteenth century . . . cannot be maintained in the light of the knowledge now at our disposal." As long as this conviction remains we may expect but an increase of that indifference which voids the influence once enjoyed by the Word of God.

Nor are we much consoled when examining into the acceptance and use of the Scriptures by our own people; for we must allow that there too, unfortunately, there has been induced a comparable neglect of the Bible, particularly as a book of private devotion. This is not the place to search out the causes for this situation, but we should not close our eyes to the fact, nor be indifferent to its effects. In this connection we think at once of the continued effort of the Fathers, of the concern of Leo XIII, and of the ardent blessing of Benedict XV, all aiming at the spread of devotion towards the Word of God. When daily reading of the Scriptures is the ideal, we can understand how far we have fallen beneath it in modern practise.

This general condition is closely related to another which comes within our acquaintance, and which is the cause of no little concern. I refer to the disposition towards destructive criticism so manifest in a great deal of the scholarly activity outside the Church. How much this has to do with the increasing

disrespect for the Bible may be a question. But it can be taken for certain that if this type of criticism is accepted for real scientific study there is small hope for an improved attitude towards the Bible. Too often the confidence that was once shown the divine Author is now turned towards the scholar who dresses error in a cloak of erudition. We all deplore this especially since there is no reason to doubt the good intentions of many a scholar who has fallen into this type of criticism, and since there is so much room for admiration of their diligent enterprise and exceptional attainments. Such a state of affairs only makes more emphatic the degree of our own inactivity.

With these reasons for energetic effort before us, we are obliged to say "nil actum." We should be able to appreciate that the words of Pius XI contain for our Association a call to undertake anew the task always sponsored by the Church, the office of protector of the divine Scriptures. The more clearly we can vision the field in which our labours lie, the more keenly will we regret our past inactivity and the more firmly resolve upon a ready response to this summons.

If in this present situation of the Bible we have distinguished two aspects, that which involves the people at large and that which applies to the scholar, it is because these are implied in the words of the Holy Father as they are expressed in the *Providentissimus Deus* and the *Spiritus Paraclitus*. We may well, then, inquire farther into these aspects of the papal invitation, since there we shall discover indication of the direction in which lie the opportunities of the Biblical Association.

We may begin with that phase of the appeal which is directed to us as men qualified in the biblical sciences. Pius XI now points rather definitely to one department of biblical studies in which there is particular need of Catholic interest. He had adverted to the fact that our distracted world needs the quieting influence of the earnest student. To this he added, "Especially in the subject of biblical studies there is need of a determined direction towards the criticism of the Sacred Text: it would be a great and inexplicable illusion to think that much had been accomplished and attained because something of value has been done." Even in his own case, he admitted, the establishment of a Pontifical Biblical Institute and of other institutions of learning does not justify his taking complacency therein. For "it is indeed a case of saying *Nil actum si quid agendum*." Then he

continues, "In the matter of criticism alone—not the study of one translation . . . but indeed the criticism of the Sacred Text—of the divine word it must be said *nil actum*, since, in truth, there remains so much to be done" (*Osservatore Romano*, May 21, 1938).

It seems hardly necessary to comment on this clear statement. But without intending to read new purposes into the words of the Pontiff, certain aspects of his intention appear worthy of emphasis.

One danger of complacency in regard to the Sacred Scriptures has always been clear to Catholic scholars: that since the Church has declared the Vulgate an authentic text nothing remains for us to do. The sense of the decree of Trent, the story of St. Jerome, the history of the Vulgate—all have protected us against this danger. We cannot say that Pius has not this in mind. Still the danger is so evident, has been adverted to so often, from the very time of Trent onward, that it seems very unlikely that the Holy Father has it mainly in view. His concern is not "the study of one translation," that translation which, however much it merits our appreciation and respect, lays no claim to more confidence than the Church has granted it.

Since Trent, however, and particularly within recent generations, much has been done towards the recovery of the Scriptures in their original languages. It is expressly to this work of criticism that the Pope is calling attention, and it may be no less against complacency in this regard that he is warning us. The very progress that has been made here justifies the warning. The majority of those intimate with the Scriptures in their original languages will admit at once that the Masoretic Text and the critical editions of the New Testament bring us close to the original autograph, much closer than any other text. Some will go farther, so far as to fall into the illusion that we have the autograph itself. There existed just this misapprehension at the close of the 16th century, as we know from the preface to the first edition of the Rheims New Testament. The error had to be fought by those who first undertook to give us our critical editions of the New Testament. It would now be sad indeed were we to fall into the same snare of thinking that, since "something of value has been done," we have nothing more to do. And here the Holy Father reminds us, *Nil actum si quid agendum*.

It would be wrong to conclude that the Holy Father is in any sense condemning what has been done, or that he is diverting our

attention from the Sacred Text as it stands today in its original dress. His intention is rather in the opposite direction: he is pointing out to Catholic scholars the duty incumbent upon them of entering into this basic phase of biblical study. This is something more than an academic enterprise. Its subject is the original message which God has deigned to send the human race. As scholars and lovers of truth it is our duty to seek out this message and to represent as the original form of the message only that which we can establish was really part of it.

Even if this interpretation of the Pontiff's meaning be weak in one regard or another, there can be no mistake of the fundamental character and profound nature of the research to which he alludes. Within recent generations new and extensive vistas have been opened to the biblical student, but none in which the effort has been more intense, the progress more notable, the achievements more subject to the danger of complacency, than that of the criticism of the Sacred Text. Although the biblical sciences now present opportunities, and difficulties, not offered the earlier workers in the field, we have in Catholic tradition no mean example of this type of work. It is enough to recall that Origen saw the need for his *Hexapla*, that Jerome had a special predilection for the *veritas hebraica*, that Augustine could write his third book of the *De Doctrina Christiana*. It is now our plain duty not only to cherish what has been so well done in the past, not only to follow the faith and diligence of such leaders, but to pursue with zeal, as they would, the new problems that modern research has brought before us.

As this message of the Holy Father applies rather particularly to us, it is well to recall here that this serious work was the ambition of the Biblical Association from the beginning. I might mention, not as an immediate project but as an illustration of the intentions of the Association, that excavation, issuance, and editing of early MSS, and efforts of this nature were considered entirely within its scope. But what was then contemplated as mere possibility is now, by the progress already made and by this invitation of the Holy See, brought more into the sphere of actual ambition.

If we should require any further motivation for entering earnestly into the labours that are ahead of us, it might be found in the practical good we can do. Few if any sciences are purely theoretical; even the most abstract have brought culture and

benefit to mankind. If this may be verified at all, it will be found true of the biblical sciences. At least from our point of view, taking our direction from the call of the Church, biblical studies tend always to make the divine message more certain, more understood by our generation, more effective.

That this practical objective was also in the mind of Pius XI when he issued this recent call may be deduced from the reference he made to St. Jerome. That saint has been set before us as a model in many aspects of scriptural study; but his most effective and lasting contribution was the Latin version which became the common text in the Western Church. The motives which led Jerome to this undertaking would most likely be of influence now, were he alive and among us, and would lead him to similar efforts at a version which might be popularly received and widely used. One of those motives, we should remember, was the invitation given him by the Holy Father. May we not, therefore, see in the disposition of the present Pontiff the same encouragement of practical fruits of our researches? This invitation and encouragement, it is true, does not stop at practical objectives, or even mention them explicitly; but these are not absent from the Holy Father's mind.

What we have in the way of opportunity for practical work requires no detailing at present. The general objective is patent, and that is the main thing. We must restore confidence in the Word of God, we must make available a text that will be within the capacity of the people, we must produce aids for the better understanding of that text, we must do all in our power to enable the divine message to reach those for whom it was destined. If we had nothing further to consider, here is a great and worthy occupation.

May it not be something more than a coincidence that this neat expression of the mind of the Church should be given at a time when we are looking with gratification on the progress of our Biblical Association? The call is clear; the Association gives promise of a ready response. All its members are affected by the summons: the scholar must lend his hours of study, the associate his support; all must serve according to their capacity while the Hierarchy provides encouragement and direction. Thus tempering our satisfaction with the serious prospect of what lies before us, we may still hope that our union in this Association may lead to accomplishments worthy of our vocation.

WILLIAM L. NEWTON.

THE ESSENCE OF THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS AND SCRIPTURE

That the Mass is a true sacrifice and not merely the representation of a sacrifice that took place in the past can be inferred from the fact that it is the fulfillment of the Pasch (Lk. 22:16). The latter, although a type and figure of things past and of things to come, was not a mere representation but a sacrificial representation. It was a true sacrifice (Num. 28:16-25; Deut. 16:2). If the type was a true sacrifice, the anti-type should be so also.

More than that, the Mass is a proper sacrifice. It possesses the character of sacrifice in the strictest sense of the word. In Biblical usage *sacrifice* has two meanings: a) In the wide or improper sense it is any act of virtue by which man freely offers himself to God, as by prayer (Ps. 140:2; Os. 14:3; Heb. 13:5), works of mercy (Ecclus. 35:4; Heb. 13:16), a holy life (Ps. 4:6), mortification (Rom. 12:1), contrition (Ps. 50:19); especially every act of the virtue of religion (worship), even though merely internal or private (Ps. 49:14; 1 Pet. 2:5,9); b) in the strict or proper sense it is the chief act of the external and public worship of God, the *sacrum factum* above all (1 Kgs. 15:22; Os. 6:1). The virtue of sacrifice, then, may be wholly internal, whereas the rite of sacrifice has an external ceremonial; the former belongs to all (Heb. 13:15), the latter is performed by priests (Heb. 5:4).

The Mass is clearly revealed as a proper sacrifice in the technical sacrificial names applied to it in prophecy (Mal. 1:10-11), in the ritual terms employed by our Lord to express the consecration (Jn. 6:52; Rom. 7:4; Col. 1:22; Heb. 10:10; Lev. 7:14; 14:17; 17:11; Rom. 3:25; 5:9; Heb. 9:10, etc.). It has its priesthood (Lk. 32:19; 1 Cor. 11:24) and its altar (Heb. 13:10; 1 Cor. 10:21), and it succeeds the ancient sacrificial rites (Lk. 22:16; Mt. 26:28, etc.). Summing up tradition, as well as the teaching of Holy Writ, the Council of Trent accordingly defined that the Mass is a true and proper sacrifice.

Our present question, however, concerns not the existence of the sacrifice of the Mass, but its essence. What part of the Mass contains the sacrifice, and what quality is it that makes that part a true and proper sacrifice? Only the Church, the official guardian and interpreter of revelation, can answer this question authoritatively. The Council of Trent did pronounce on the unity

of the Mass with the Cross, and on its commemorative and applicatory character, on its fulfillment of ancient types.¹ Other points have been left open to discussion, especially the sacrificial moment of the Mass and the precise manner in which the action becomes sacrificial.

Our subject being the essence of the Mass, we should premise what we understand by essence. It seems that by essence we should understand here as elsewhere that note which is both distinctive and fundamental. First, it should be *distinctive*, a feature in which all sacrifices differ from the non-sacrificial and especially from ordinances most closely related to sacrifice. It should be a feature, too, distinctive of the Mass-sacrifice from other sacrifices even in the New Testament. Secondly, it should be *fundamental*, a feature of the service to which the other features are secondary, preparatory or consequent. Hence while the benefits and fruits of the Mass are indissolubly united with the Mass itself, they are logically subsequent to it and are regarded as effects, not the essence.

For a study of what is distinctive and fundamental in sacrifice the Bible is our first source, since in its pages are found both the history of sacrifice from its origin to its culmination, and likewise an abundance of detail on the ceremonial law to which it belongs and the rites by which it was and is performed. It shall be our effort, then, with the help of the Church's doctors and theologians, to contrast and compare the Biblical sacrifices among themselves and with the Mass, with a view to understand somewhat their meaning.

Not all the sacrifices mentioned in the Scriptures, however, enjoyed the divine approval. The Bible itself, as well as profane records, testify to the existence of sacrifice among the Gentile nations of antiquity, such as the Moabites (Num. 25:1-3), Madianites (Exod. 18:1,12), Ammonites (3 Kgs. 11:5-8, 32), Syrians and Sidonians (Jdgs. 10:6-7), Greeks (1 Mach. 1:50; 1 Cor. 8:14), Lycaonians (Acts 14:12). These heathen rites are worthy of study inasmuch as they testify to the universality of religion and of the sacrificial idea. Nevertheless since neither they nor the schismatical worship of Samaria, nor the illegal "high places" and private shrines of Israel, can be regarded as types of the Mass or as closely related to it (Isa. 57:5-7; Jer.

¹ Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum*, Nos. 938-940.

44:3-25; Ez. 16:20-21; 20:28; 23:39; Os. 11:2; Jn. 4:22; etc.), we shall confine ourselves to the authorized sacrifices of the Bible.

It is agreed among Catholics, and largely among non-Catholics also, that the legitimate sacrifices of the Scripture are the following: 1) the patriarchal sacrifices, such as those of Cain and Abel, Noe, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, of Balaam, Jethro and Job (Gen. 4:3 ff.; 8:20 ff.; 15:6 ff.; 22:1 ff.; 26:24-25; 31:54; Num. 23:1 ff.; Ex. 3:1; 18:12; Job 1:5; 42:7-9); 2) the Mosaic sacrifices, which included the once offered sacrifices of the Pass-over and the Covenant, and the constantly offered Levitical sacrifices of the ensuing fourteen centuries (Ex. 12:1 ff.; 24:1 ff.; Lev. 23:1 ff.); 3) the New Testament sacrifice of Christ (Heb. 10:12; Mal. 1:11; 1 Cor. 10:21). This last includes not only the sacrifice of the Cross, but also the Eucharistic sacrifice offered in the Last Supper and in the Mass.

In comparing these sacrifices we note along with individual differences a uniform agreement in certain distinctive and outstanding characteristics. Sacrifices differ: by reason of the religious dispensation to which they belong, patriarchal, Mosaic or Christian; by reason of ritual, some being bloody, others unbloody (Lev. chap. 1 and 2); by reason of their purpose, some being for sin, others for thanksgiving (Lev. 3, 4 and 5). There is even considerable variety of names in the Hebrew and the Greek.

In general, however, there is the common characteristic that sacrifice is composed of two parts, an outward visible and ceremonial one and an inward invisible one which only the mind perceives. The outward sacrifice is not performed for its own sake; its reason is not natural, but symbolic. But of this more will be said below.

PREREQUISITES OF SACRIFICE

On its external side, proper or ritual sacrifice always presupposes a sacred person (the mediator or priest), a sacred object or gift, and a sacred place or altar.

The priest. Every High-Priest, and indeed every priest, must be called, not by himself, or by mere human authority, but by God (Heb. 5:4), at least under a supernatural order. Even in patriarchal times a mediator was required who offered for others. By authority his appointment was divine, though it may have

come immediately through human law; for it appears that in the family, sacrifice was offered by the father (Gen. 8:20), the sons (Gen. 4:3-4), especially the first-born (Num. 3:41); in the clan, by the patriarch (Gen. 31:54); in the city, by the king (Gen. 14:18). In some cases God commanded individuals to offer sacrifice, or showed approval of their sacrifice (Gen. 15:9; 4:4; 8:21). When we come to the Mosaic law we find the priestly office restricted to Aaron's descendants (Num. 3:3 ff.), all others being excluded, not because of personal unworthiness, but because of incapacity, even Levites (Num. 16:8-10), and kings (2 Par. 26:16 ff.).

In the New Law Christ Himself was appointed a priest by God (Heb. 5:1-10), and the Christian priesthood traces its lineage back by apostolic succession to Christ (Lk. 22:19; 1 Tim. 4:14; 2 Tim 1:6). In the Supper He offered in His own visible self; in the Mass He appears in the person of His priests whom He commissioned to act in His name (1 Cor. 11:24-25), and He, the principal priest, is present as they act.

The offering. Possibly in patriarchal times the choice of the sacred object may have been left to the offerers; but in Abraham's sacrifice God Himself prescribed the offering (Gen. 15:9; 22:2,12-13). For the Passover a lamb was to be used (Ex. 12:3).

The Levitical code prescribed minutely the kinds of animals and foods and incense that should be employed (Lev. 1:3 ff.; 2:1 ff.; Ex. 30:34 ff.); and set aside the blood (Gen. 9:4; Lev. 17:14; Acts 15:29) and the fats (Lev. 3:4,9,14,17; Num. 18:17) for the altar. Expressly excluded were sacrifices of human beings (Lev. 18:21; 20:2), of unclean and unfit animals (Isa. 65:4; 66:17; Mal. 1:6-8), of leaven and honey (Lev. 2:11). Salt was used in all sacrifices (Lev. 2:13). The sacrificial fire itself was regulated, and it seems that Nadab and Abiu, Aaron's sons, who were punished with death, sinned by substituting a fire different from that prescribed in the law (Lev. 10:1-11).

In the New Testament the offering is Christ Himself, specially appointed by the Father to take the place of the imperfect offering of the former dispensation (Heb. 10:1-10; 1 Cor. 12:23 ff.). Christ is manifestly the offering in the Last Supper, where He appears as the Lamb of God and the new Pasch; on the Cross, where He fulfills the types of the emissary goat and the red heifer, of Isaac and the Atonement; in the Mass, where He is

the Clean Oblation of Mal. 1:11, the Body given and the Blood poured out (Mt. 26:28; Mk. 14:24; Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25).²

The altar. Among the patriarchs sacrifice was offered out of doors, and usually, it seems, in hallowed spots, in which God had manifested Himself, or which He had chosen for the purpose. Noe sacrificed on the mountain where he was taken from the ark (Gen. 9:15 ff.), Abraham at Moriah, as God had appointed (Gen. 22:2). From the time of Noe at least, altars, crude in material and design, were used (Gen. 8:20).

After the delivery of the Decalogue God gave instruction about altars and the places where they might be raised (Ex. 20:24-25). Then came the rule that an altar might be had only in the sacred buildings (Lev. 17:3-9), and at one central spot (Deut. 12:8,11; 1 Par. 22 and 23; 2 Par. 2 ff.). Only the central altar was the מִזְבֵּחַ *misbeah*, place of sacrifice. The temples and altars built on Garizim and at Leontopolis in Egypt were not recognized, and their sacrifices were held invalid.³

But the Author of sacrifice is not held to the Levitical rules, and it was by divine appointment also that in the New Law the Last Supper was celebrated outside the temple in an upper room (Jn. 4:21; Lk. 22:10-13), the sacrifice of the Cross at Jerusalem, but outside the walls of the city (Lk. 13:33; Heb. 12:11), and that Mass is offered in every place from the rising of the sun to its setting (Mal. 1:11; Acts 2:46; 1 Cor. 11:20).

EXTERNAL SACRIFICE

Priest, offering and altar as divinely appointed are conditions presupposed to sacrifice. But all of them together could not constitute sacrifice without the Sacred Action. Always the priest acts upon the gift in the holy place. This ritual in each case is something sacred and divine, having come from God and being directed towards God.

Of the patriarchal rites we read that some were approved by God (Gen. 4:21,48), others ordered by Him (Gen. 22:1). Possibly others may have been privately inspired.⁴

The Passover ceremonies were commanded in an edict (Ex. 12:3), and the Levitical rites were delivered in minute detail (Lev. 1:11 ff.). The rite determined by God could not be changed by man (Lev. 10:1-11).

² Maas, *Christ in Type and Prophecy*, II pp. 245, 306, 307, 328, 330, 338 ff.

³ Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, V pp. 1449, 1450.

⁴ *Summa Theologica*, 1. 2. q. 103. a. 1.

The details of the bloody and unbloody sacrifices of Christ were also fixed with great precision. The various circumstances of our Lord's Passion were commanded by the Father (Phil. 2:8; Jn. 14:31; Rom. 8:32), and the liturgy of the Eucharistic sacrifice has Christ as its Author (Lk. 22:19).

PRE-SACRIFICIAL ACTS

Those prescribed parts of the ritual that are not performed by the priest himself, or not in reference to the prescribed object, or not at the prescribed altar, should be regarded as accessories, not essentials of sacrifice. They do not appear in all sacrifices, e. g., the patriarchal, and they are less solemn parts of the service; whereas the essence should be that rite which is common and most important. We may illustrate by certain acts of the Levitical rites that preceded the sacrifice as material or ritual preparation, such as the slaying of an animal victim by its lay offerer, or the waving of the offering to and fro and up and down by the priest before he took it to the altar (Lev. 1:4-5; 4:15; 10:15; 16:7,10).

These pre-sacrificial acts of bringing the gift to the holy place, of praying over it, of slaughtering it away from the altar, and the like, have their counterparts in the sacrifice of Christ.

At the Last Supper the typical Pasch and the washing of feet were evidently preparatory acts. The giving of thanks with blessing were not parts of the Paschal rite⁵ and they seem to have preceded the consecration.⁶ At any rate, they do not stand out as distinctive and dominant rites of sacrifice. They resemble the extraordinary ceremonies that preceded the multiplication of the loaves (Mt. 14:19) and the resurrection of Lazarus (Jn. 11:41), rather than a ceremony related to death. The fraction also was a prefatory act at the multiplication of loaves, and in the Bible "breaking of bread" is referred rather to human use than to sacrifice.⁷ The fraction did not affect the Body of Christ itself, whereas the essential act of sacrifice is performed on the offering.

In the Passion the prayers and acts of Christ in Gethsemane were the proximate preparation. The remote preparation began with the entrance of Our Lord into this world (Heb. 10:5 ff.). There does not appear any solid ground for believing that

⁵ Lagrange, *Ev. Selon S. Marc*, p. 353.

⁶ Cornely on 1 Cor. 11:24.

⁷ Cornely, *loc. cit.*

Christ offered partial or prefigurative sacrifices throughout His life, on such occasions as the Presentation. He did offer internal sacrifice, however, continually (Lk. 12:50).

In the Mass, all that goes before the consecration, though based on the procedure at the Last Supper and the Apostolic practice of introductory instruction (Acts 2:42), precedes the presence of the Gift on the altar, and so must be regarded as a preliminary to the sacrifice itself.

THE RITUAL OBLATION

With the setting of priest, altar and gift and the ritual act of preparation, all is ready for the Sacred Action of sacrifice. What is its nature? Always we read that it is an act of *Giving* or Oblation. The priest brings the sacred object to the altar. Here we have an essential act of sacrifice, one that is both distinctive and dominant. From first to last every kind and variety of sacrifice is a present of the sacred gift to the altar. And it is precisely this trait of giving that distinguishes the two most important classes of ceremonies, the sacrifices and the sacraments. In the sacraments, for example in the Paschal Supper and Holy Communion, something is *received* by man from the altar, whereas in sacrifice something is *given* by man to the altar. This sacrificial oblation, the bringing of the gift to the altar by the priest, is also quite distinct from the pre-sacrificial oblation, the bringing of the gift to the priest by the lay offerer (Lev. 1:2-4); and also from the non-sacrificial oblation (contribution), the bringing of a gift not meant for the altar, such as the donating of oxen and wagons for the work of the Levites (Num. 7:1-9), the contributing of portions and other support to the priest who offers one's sacrifice (Num. 18:9,10; 2 Mach. 12:43).

Oblation is also the main act in sacrifice, as we may conclude from the fact that from it sacrifice has taken many of its chief names. The principal Biblical names of sacrifice express either the kind of effects produced, as in *peace-offering*, *sin-offering*, *thank-offering*, or the kind of ritual acts employed. Expressive of the sacred action are two classes of terms, that may be described generically as *oblation* and *immolation*. As to the first, we meet constantly descriptions of sacrifice as offering, bestowal, presentation. Such terms are the Hebrew הִקְרִיב *hikrib*, הִגִּישׁ *hig-gish*, קָרָבָן *qorban*, מִגֶּשׁ *muggash*, the Greek προσφέρω, ἀναφέρω signifying *to bring to*, *to bring up*, *to bring near*; also the Hebrew מִנְחָה *minhah* and the Greek δίδόμενον δῶρον expressing the idea

of making a gift or present.⁸ The Vulgate *oblatio* and the Douay *offering* and *gift* convey this essential action of sacrifice.

This first aspect of the Sacrificial Action, the giving, appears in the unbloody sacrifice of Christ through the twofold consecration by which His presence is brought on the altar. "This is My Body *given* (delivered) for you" (Lk. 22:19); or "This is My Body which is on your behalf" (1 Cor. 11:24), mean that Our Lord's Body on the altar is being offered to God as an expiatory sacrifice.⁹ "Neque dixit *vobis*, sed *pro vobis*, scil., DATUR ET EFFUNDITUR DEO; quod proprie est sacrificii."¹⁰

In the bloody sacrifice the giving-action appears in the free act by which our Lord delivered Himself over from the moment of the arrest in the garden to the final moment when He gave up His soul to the Father (Mt. 26:39, 52-54; Mk. 14:42; Lk. 23:46; Jn. 10:12-18; 18:3-8; 19:30; 1 Tim. 2:6; Tit. 2:14).

THE RITUAL IMMOLATION

The presenting of the gift at the altar is not, however, the whole of the Sacrificial Action. For the giving to the altar is so accomplished that the gift is made a victim, or is simultaneously taken away from other uses. The Hebrews were familiar with the idea of making a gift to religion by sacring or hallowing it, so that it might be used for no other purpose, as we see in Lev. 27:28.¹¹ They would readily perceive that the sacrificial gift to the altar was so made that, while part of it might return to the use of the priest or offerers, the sacrificial part was sacred and devoted to altar use alone (See Lev. 2.9 and elsewhere).

This irrevocable taking away from other uses (immolation) was performed in various ways, but since the victim is of the animate order, vegetable or animal, the immolation modes may be reduced to two:

By putting to death on the altar. This mode of immolation by physical separation of body and blood was employed when the victim was living. It seems to have been in use in patriarchal

⁸ Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, III, pp. 587 ff.; Zorell, *Lexicon Graecum N. T.*, pp. 109, 346, 1149.

⁹ Lagrange, *Evang. selon S. Luc*, p. 544; Sales, *Il N. Testamento Commentato*, I, p. 316; Poelzl-Martindale, *The Passion and Glory of Christ*, pp. 57 ff.

¹⁰ Jansenius.

¹¹ Sales, *Il V. T. Commentato*, vol. 1, p. 481.

times, as we may gather from the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. 22: 9-10).

By showing forth of death on the altar. This method was used when the victim was already dead,¹² and it consisted in a separate destruction or disposal of the body and blood. The body was burnt on the altar, the blood was poured out at the foot of the altar and so allowed to be carried off by channels into the ground. (Lev. 1:7-9 and elsewhere). This form of immolation was imitated in the unbloody sacrifices. Cereal and bread offerings and incense were destroyed by burning (Lev. 2:2 ff.); libations of oil or wine were poured out at the altar or on it (Gen. 35:14; 49:11; Ecclus. 50:16-17).

Like oblation, immolation is an essential, that is a distinctive and dominant, part of sacrifice. It is distinctive, being found in all sacrifices as the characteristic that determines their own oblation and differentiates it from other oblations.

In a few instances of patriarchal rites which we have numbered among sacrifices, Scripture is silent about the special *modus* observed; but the fact that there was an immolation is not denied. Cain and Abel, having set apart certain portions of their produce and animals for sacrifice, must have disposed of them in some rite of self-denial (Gen. 4:2-5). Abraham in his Covenant sacrifice (Gen. 15:9) possibly disposed of his sacrifice by exposure, as equivalent to burning.¹³ The offering of bread and wine by Melchisedech (Gen. 14:18) according to Patristic authority was a sacrificial banquet.¹⁴ The context also supports this interpretation. The preceding immolation probably was made by a burning and libation, as this method was practised among the Semites.¹⁵

In fact immolation is not a distinct act from sacrificial oblation. To give to the altar, "the place of immolation," specially constructed for burning and libation, is to give to immolation or to give by immolation. Sacrifice is not oblation plus immolation, but immolative oblation. The action, then, of giving to the

¹² The slaying of the animal by priest (2 Par. 29:24) or layman (Lev. 1:5) before it was taken to the altar constituted pre-sacrificial immolation, and should not be confused with sacrificial immolation at the altar (Gen. 22:16).

¹³ Vigouroux, *op. cit.*, vol. 5, page 1317.

¹⁴ Cremin in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, May, 1938, pp. 469 ff.

¹⁵ Vigouroux, *op. cit.*, vol. 5, p. 1312; *Cath. Ency.*, XIII, pp. 311-312; Brinkworth in *Clergy Review*, Nov., 1935, p. 355.

altar while taking away from other uses is the chief characteristic of sacrifice; it is the note that distinguishes sacrifice from the ceremony that resembles it most nearly, namely, votive offerings and religious contributions.¹⁶ The natural use of the objects brought before the altar was the service of man: as beasts of burden in the case of animals; as food and drink in the case of flesh and blood, bread and wine; as means of health, or gratification in the case of oil and incense. When the gift was meant as a mere oblation, it was put to its natural use. Votive offerings were used for the adornment and maintenance of the sanctuary (Ex. 35:5 ff.; 1 Par. 29:1 ff.); the oxen presented by the chieftains in Num. 7 were set aside for the wagons that carried the tabernacle; tithes, first-fruits, offerings for the first-born at presentation, were applied to the support of the ministers (Deut. 8:8; 2 Esdr. 10:36; Num. 18:20; Ex. 13:11-16; 22:29-30; 18:15-16; etc.). Sacrifice, on the contrary, was not merely giving something, but giving it up or losing it, as far as the natural use was concerned.

The dominant position of immolation in sacrifice is attested by the numerous Biblical names that call attention to it:

The idea of taking away from natural for sacrificial purposes is expressed in the sacrificial term *הָרִים* *harim* and possibly also in the noun *תְּרוּמָה* *terumah* frequently used in reference to sacrificial rites.

Immolation by slaughter explains the name *זֶבַח* *zebah* (slaughter), which was given even to unbloody sacrifices.

The rite of burning on the altar accounts for the following names given to sacrifice in the Bible: *עֹלָה* *holah* (that which goes up, or that which ascends in flames); *חֹלִיל* *cholil* (entire, used like the previous word for the whole-burnt offerings); *קָטַר* *qatter* (to make into sweet smoke); *אִשְׁשָׁה* *ishshah* (fire-offering); *ὁλοκαύτωμα*, holocaust; *θυσία*, from *θύω* originally meaning *burn*.

¹⁶ *Summa Theologica*, 2. 2. q. 85. a. 3. ad 3; q. 86, a. 1.

¹⁷ On these and other names of sacrifice see Hastings, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 587 ff.; Vigouroux, *op. cit.*, VI, pp. 1728, 1729; Zorell, *op. cit.*, pp. 599, 600, 907. The Latin word *immolatio* contains the same thought of separation, since it is derived from the ancient Roman practice of sprinkling the victim of sacrifice with meal (*mola*) as a token that it was marked and reserved for the altar (Swaby, *The Last Supper and Calvary*, p. 49).

The rite of pouring drink offerings or libations also gave special names to sacrifice. Such are חִסִּיחַ *hisich* and σπένδω.

In the sacrifice of Christ immolation is found similar to that of the ancient sacrifices, but superior to them. The anti-type surpasses the type.¹⁸

In the Passion the immolation mode is that of *death*, but with differences due to the dignity of Priest and Victim.

The Priest does not slay the Victim, for Christ is both the Priest and Victim. The killing of Christ was a sacrilege not a sacrifice (Jn. 19:11). But He did immolate Himself by offering Himself to death (Jn. 10:12). Human sacrifices such as prevailed among the pagans (4 Kgs. 3:27; Wis. 12:4-6) were denounced in Scripture as criminal (Lev. 18:2; 20:2). But our Lord gave Himself to death willingly and with the Father's authorization (Jn. 10:18; Philip. 2:8).¹⁹

The Victim is not destroyed or burned, as was customary in the ancient sacrifices (Lev. 1:6 ff.). On the cross the body of Christ was broken in the sense of being wounded or slain; and He was a holocaust in the sense of a whole offering. But as with the typical lamb, no bone of Him was broken (Ex. 12:46; Num. 9:42; Jn. 19:36). Nor was His body to see corruption in the tomb (Ps. 15:8; Acts 2:27; 13:37), much less to be a burnt-offering.²⁰

In the Eucharist the immolation mode is by *showing forth of death* in the consecration (1 Cor. 11:26). At the Supper the time appointed for His death had not arrived, in the Mass it has passed (Rom. 6:9); there can be no physical separation of the body and blood. Neither can the Lord's death be shown by any form of destruction. Separate corruption of His body and blood was not possible even on the cross, while He was in the mortal state; and much less is it possible in His glorious state (Heb. 9:26). There is no separate destruction, but there is a separate consecration of the body and blood.

The showing of the Lord's death in the Mass is only a representative immolation, in its relation to the death-immolation of

¹⁸ *Summa Theologica*, 3. q. 46. a. 4. ad 1.

¹⁹ *Summa Theologica*, 3. q. 47. aa. 2, 3.

²⁰ Minor ceremonies, such as lights, vestments, incense, consecrated altar, were lacking on Calvary. An onlooker unacquainted with Biblical ritual might have thought he was witnessing an execution rather than a sacred rite. But those familiar with the ancient types and prophecies would perceive all the essentials; appointed priest, victim, sacred place, ritual actions.

the cross. But it is a real immolation inasmuch as it designates the body and the blood as set apart here and now for sacrificial ends solely.²¹

POST SACRIFICIAL ACTS

Though the giving to sacrificial and the taking from natural use, of the offering, or in other words the immolative oblation, is the main act of sacrifice, there are other acts of a secondary kind annexed to it. These minor acts, as was said above, are such as are not enacted by the priest, or not at the chief sacred spot, or such as come before or after the chief sacred moment. Those that preceded oblation-immolation were treated above when we spoke of the material and ritual preparations. It remains to mention the ceremonial acts that followed the sacrifice as a ritual or material sequel, such as a sacred repast, the sprinkling of the blood, the disposal of remains left over from the table or altar (Ex. 12:8 ff.; 13:6 ff.; 24:5-8; Lev. 4:5,6; 7:15; 10:14; Num. 18:10 ff.; Heb. 13:11; 16:1 ff.)

Among such adjuncts to sacrifice a special solemnity attaches to the blood sprinkling connected with the once offered holocaust of the ancient Covenant (Ex. 24:6-8) and that of the day of Atonement offered once a year only (Ex. 30:10; Lev. 16:2 ff.; Heb. 9:7). Very important also was the sacred meal, which was obligatory in certain sacrifices that were not holocausts. The gift to the altar in the olden sacrifices was usually food, and except in the whole-burnt offering, some was left over. The law concerning this sacred food that remained was that the priest himself should eat it (Num. 18:17-18; Lev. 7:14-15; 6:26). In some cases a portion was kept for others also, especially at the Paschal supper (Ex. 12:42 ff.; Num. 9:12; Jn. 19:36).²² The eating of sacrificial food by the priest appears consequently as most closely related to certain sacrifices. But though an integral or complementary part of the service, the sacred banquet is not of the essence of sacrifice, since it does not always occur and even when prescribed consists in receiving rather than in giving. It belongs to the class of ceremonies known as sacraments.

The sacrifice of Christ like the typical sacrifices has certain ritual sequels annexed to it. The Passion follows the rite of the holocaust in that it has no sacrificial repast. But like the Cove-

²¹ Merklebach, *Summa Theologiae Moralis*, III, p. 274, No. 324.

²² *Summa Theologica*, 1. 2. q. 102. a. 3. ad 8.

nant and Atonement rites it has its sprinkling of blood (Heb. 9:13 ff.). The visible issuance of blood and water from the Saviour's side after the completion of His sacrifice is very specially noted by St. John (Jn. 19:34). It seems to be the equivalent of the ancient blood aspersion.²³

The Eucharistic sacrifice, on the contrary, resembles in rite the offerings of Melchisedech and of the Pasch (Gen. 14:18; Ex. 13:7). It has the supplementary banquet in the communion, of which the celebrant at least must always partake (Lk. 22:17-20; Mk. 14:12; 1 Cor. 11:23-25). The communion of the priest belongs to the integrity of the Mass; but it complements, and does not constitute the essence.²⁴

INTERNAL SACRIFICE

The Eucharist is the great "mystery of faith," for in it are hidden under sacramental veils both the divinity and the humanity of Christ. The mysterious, however, is not the same as the meaningless. In pagan mysteries rites were used whose meaning was not known or was kept secret. But Scripture does not approve of an unintelligent performance of religious ceremonies, such as was rendered by the Samaritans and the heathen (Jn. 4:22; Wis. 14:15-23; Acts 17:23 ff.).

What was the meaning, then, of the rites of sacrifice which we have been studying? It is clear that the meaning was not natural, that the actions were not performed for their own sakes, that the reasons were not the usual or obvious ones. The animals were killed and their fats burned not to prepare meat for the table, or to dispose of leavings. All this could have been done and was done on other occasions without the accompaniment of sacrificial ceremony. The meaning then was not on the surface; the sacrificial rites stood for something other than themselves, and were not performed for their own sakes. In brief, they were sensible signs symbolizing some hidden or unseen reality.

Since God does all things well (Wis. 11:21), we might expect that in symbols instituted by Himself for common use, the outward signs would be appropriate and the inward signification sufficiently familiar. An ambiguous trumpet call or signal only confuses. And so in fact the external sacrifices of the Bible correspond well with the inner sacrifice which they represent. The

²³ See Lagrange on this passage in *Ev. selon S. Jean*.

²⁴ Pohle-Preuss, *The Sacraments*, II, p. 344.

outward action of giving is like the interior act of giving which it pictures to the eye. The relative sacrifices of Old and New Testaments are like the absolute sacrifice of the Cross, inasmuch as they too are sacrifices and contain or show forth death.

Moreover, an authoritative and sacred meaning is impressed on the rites by God, their Author. Sacrifice is dealt with in that part of the law that treats of signs of sacred things, such as sacraments, holy days, tithes, vows, religious objects; the meaning is set forth of the background and ritual, of the tabernacle and its parts (Heb. 9:9-10), of the blood rite (Lev. 17:11), of the incense sacrifice (Deut. 23:10; Ps. 140:2; Dan. 2:46; Apoc. 5:8); the people are commanded to instruct their children both as regards the ritual (Ex. 12:1 ff.) and the meaning or intention of its ceremonies (Ex. 12:26-27). The sign language of sacrifice was charged with centuries of meaning to the Jewish people. Those who heard and beheld the sacrificial phraseology and action of Christ at the Last Supper could have had no doubt of His sacrificial purpose.

Proper or ritual sacrifices therefore must be classed under the heading of sacred signs. They are essentially related to some reality which they represent, and like all relative things must derive their adequate species from the thing to which they are related.²⁵ A sign as such is constituted not merely of the visible symbol, but also of a relationship to the invisible present or the absent (past or future) reality that it symbolizes. And so a proper sacrifice is essentially an outward sign of an inward sacrifice.²⁶ This interior sacrifice of the soul, like the exterior sacrifice of the body, is made up of oblation and immolation.

THE INTERIOR OBLATION

In the external oblation something was brought to the altar. The visible recipient, the sacred place, was a symbol of the unseen presence of God, who though uncontained in any place or space, yet wishes to be approached at designated sanctuaries (Gen. 28: 16-18; Ex. 24:4; 40:31-36; 3 Kgs. 8:27-29). What is brought to the altar, therefore, is said to be brought before God,

²⁵ Salmanticenses, *Cursus Theol.*, XVII p. 29, No. 29.

²⁶ "Omne sacramentum visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, i. e., sacrum signum est" (St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 1. 10, cap. 5). "Sacrificium secundum se est in genere signi" (Billot, *De Ecclesiae Sacramentis*, I, p. 584).

into His presence; it is presented to Him (Ex. 18:12; Lev. 1:5, 11; 14:19; 24:5,8).

The visible gift also is a symbol of an invisible gift. The offering made to God is not a material thing, for He has no need of animals or food, as the pagans foolishly thought (Ps. 49:12; Dan. 14:12; Isa. 1:11). He is a spirit and desires chiefly offerings of a spiritual kind (Ps. 49:7-15; Jn. 4:24). The material gifts laid upon the altar stand therefore for the offerer himself, his soul and its acts (Lev. 17:10-14; Deut. 12:23). The imposition of hands by the offerer upon the head of the victim showed that the offerer passed what was agreeable to God in himself to the animal his representative (Ex. 29:10, 15, 19; Lev. 1:4).²⁷

The internal offering made to God is not, however, an act of faith or of charity, but of worship. The offerer may be unworthy as in the case of Cain, whose sacrifice was rejected, it seems, because of his lack of faith or charity (Heb. 11:4; 1 Jn. 3:12), and yet have the intention to worship. The Scriptures condemn the sinfulness and errors of sacrificers without rejecting sacrifice itself (1 Kgs. 15:22; Os. 6:6; Ecclus. 4:17; Mt. 9:13). Except in the case of Christ, then, the external ritual does not signify the personal holiness or worthiness of the minister (Heb. 5:1-3; 7:26-28).

The internal oblation must include, however, at least the intention of worship, without which external worship would be but mockery or derision (Mt. 27:29, 37; Lk. 23:11). The gift to God is not a liberal act of assistance, since the Lord of all things cannot suffer need or receive help from His creatures (1 Par. 29:10-16; Ps. 49:12; Dan. 14:2). It is a gift of honor, such as is paid to princes (Gen. 32:13, 18, 20, 21; 45:11, 15, 25, 26; Ex. 23:15; 34:20; Jdgs. 3:15, 17-18; 1 Kgs. 10:27; 2 Kgs. 8:2,6; Ps. 45:12; Mal. 1:6; Mt. 2:11).

The honor which sacrifice shows to God is supreme or latria. The honorific gifts bestowed on princes might be taken from inanimate things, especially precious metals and stones. But according to patriarchal and Mosaic laws sacrifices for the altar were taken only from the order of living things, animal and vegetable, and only from the choicest of these (Ex. 23:18; Lev. 2:1; 22:20; 30:34 ff.). The blood, as representing life and the soul of man himself, was reserved for the altar (Lev. 17:11). In Christian sacrifice the gift is the very best among all things

²⁷ Vigouroux, *op. cit.*, III, p. 848.

created, namely, the humanity of Christ (Jn. 3:16; 1 Pet. 1:19). Sacrificial giving, then, chiefly means that to Him who is Greatest and Best of all should be given the gifts that are greatest and best. Such a conception was not above the intelligence of even the early age of sacrifice. In Genesis God appears as the Author of being, in Exodus as the One who is Being in the highest sense (Gen. 1:1; Ex. 3:14). For men with such a lofty idea of the Deity it would not be difficult to see in the presentation of life-blood at His shrine the acknowledgment of Him as the Supreme Being, the First and the Last (Gen. 1:1; 17:1; Ex. 3:6,14; Lev. 17:10-14; Deut. 12:23; 19:16; 2 Kgs. 23:17; 1 Par. 11:19; Ecclus. 14:19; Ps. 41:4; 44:6; Apoc. 1:8-17; 22:13).

Acknowledgment of the greatness of God's gifts to us by the virtue of gratitude is less than recognition of the greatness of God in Himself by worship. To express gratitude through a votive oblation, the Israelite was permitted to use what was good (Lev. 2:11-12); but, to express what he thought of God Himself in sacrificial oblation, only the best might be employed as the gift. Sacrificial oblation was also the supreme salute reserved to Deity alone.²⁸

THE INTERNAL IMMOLATION

The taking away of the offering from all other service than that of the altar, its death and showing of death by burning and pouring out, do not express destruction of the offerer, nor even penalty. The immolation-thought should harmonize with the oblation-thought of honor to God. But God is not honored by the destruction of the offerer, His handiwork and worshipper. Moreover, while sacrifice was offered to God, it was offered for man. Its aim was that God's worshipper might be raised up, but that sin, especially idolatry, might be destroyed (Ex. 20:1-5; 22:20). God does not need worship, but man needs it, that his sins may be pardoned (Heb. 5:1; Rom. 4:5), that he may be kept in holiness (Heb. 5:9), that he may attain salvation (Heb. 10:19). Sacrifice was meant to honor God and benefit man.

Penalty, it is true, might be associated with the thought of honor to God, in the manner of a reparation for insult offered the divine majesty. The fact is, however, that not all sacrifices were

²⁸ "Videmus in omni republica observari quod summum rectorem aliquo signo singulari honorant, quod cuicumque alteri defferetur, esset crimen laesae majestatis. Et ideo soli Deo debemus offerre exteriora sacrificia" (*Summa Theologica*, 2. 2. q. 85. a. 2).

sin-offerings; that immolation was practiced even more completely in the holocaust; that even in the sin-offering the victim was not regarded as representing sin, but was treated as most holy and might be eaten by the priests (Lev. 6:25 ff.).²⁹

More satisfactory, we think, is the view that the outward immolation represented an inner immolation of the spirit, the entire subjection of the creature before God. This should not be identified with obedience or humility, as if sinners and the proud could not validly exercise sacrifice. We speak now only of that submission that is necessarily included in the idea of honor. He who reverences another as his superior, thereby recognizes himself as inferior. He who acknowledges God as the Supreme Being, to that extent acknowledges himself and the world as God's creature, made by Him and for Him. He who adores God as the Lord, thereby in worship renounces all rival gods (Ex. 20:2-3). Sacrifice was meant to express, like other signs of adoration, such as prostrations, genuflexions, not only the majesty of God as Supreme Being, but also (for they are inseparable), our own inferiority and submission.³⁰

The ritual immolation is also well suited to express this self-surrender to God.

The separation of the gift from its offerer's use speaks the creature's inferiority to God, to whom alone the sacrificial use belongs. When we read in 1 Kgs. 9:19 ff. that Samuel took away from the banquet table the choice portion of the meal and reserved it for Saul, we readily perceive a token that he and the rest were less in dignity than Saul. Similarly when the people beheld the bodies of sacrificial animals divided into portions, part for the priests, part for the worshippers, and the best part for the altar, they felt the meaning of the words: "Not to us, but to thy name be the glory" (Ps. 113:1). The self-deprivation meant that to the creature it belongs to give, not to receive, sacrifice.

The death of the victim enacted at the altar also recognized the entire subordination of all things to God. The animating

²⁹ Deliverance from sin and penalty may be found in one and the same rite with sacrifice; sacrament and sacrifice in the same ordinance; testament and covenant in the same promise. Yet it does not follow that all these values or modes are identical (See *Summa Theol.*, 3. q. 48. a. 6. ad 3; q. 79. a. 7).

³⁰ See Salmanticenses, *op. cit.*, XVI, pp. 325, 553, 567, 571.

principle represented by the blood and taken from the victim to the altar was an impressive symbol of the truth that it is not we who are Life and Being, or to whom existence belongs by natural right.

The internal oblation with its recognition of God as the Greatest and Best, the Source and Destiny of all, is, as was said above, the supreme act of homage, due to God alone (Acts 14:11 ff.). Similarly the internal immolation by which inferiority to God is recognized is more profound than the recognition of inferiority to any creature. Even the human nature of Christ in itself is infinitely lower than the majesty of God, whereas only a finite distance separates the lowest and the highest creature. If, then, we lower ourselves internally before creatures whom we revere, immeasurably more must we in our souls lower ourselves before God. The lesser obeisance expressed by bows, inclinations, prostrations may be given to creatures (Gen. 23:7; 33:3; 42:6); but even tyrants did not demand for themselves sacrificial obeisance (Dan. 3:14; 1 Mach. 1:57).

Liturgical formulas were not usually prescribed for sacrifices, the rite expressing itself in the language of ceremony rather than in that of words. There are nevertheless certain memorable prayers pronounced on the occasion of sacrifices which the Bible has handed down to us. One of these we now quote as being a beautiful wording of inner sacrifice. It is taken from the prayer of David as he prepared for the building of the temple (1 Par. 29:10 ff.).

Oblation. "Blessed art thou, O Lord, the God of Israel, our Father from eternity to eternity. Thine, O Lord, are magnificence, and power, and glory and victory, and to thee is praise; for all that is in heaven and earth is thine. Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art above all princes. Thine are riches and thine is glory, Thou hast dominion over all. In thy hand is power and might; in thy hand greatness and the empire of all things. Now therefore, O Lord, we give thanks to thee, and we praise thy glorious name."

Immolation. "Who am I and what is my people that we should be able to promise thee all these things? all things are thine, and we have given thee what we received of thy hand. For we are sojourners before thee, and strangers, as were all our fathers. Our days upon earth are as a shadow, and there is no stay."

The oblation thoughts of Christ during the Passion, which St. Paul (Eph. 5:2) describes as "an odor of sweetness to God," may be summed up in the wording of Heb. 10:5 ff.: "On enter-

ing into the world Christ said: Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire (i. e., of the Mosaic law), but a body thou didst frame for me. Burnt-offerings and sin-offerings pleased thee not. Then said I, Lo, I come—in the roll of the book it is so written of me—to do thy will, O God.”

Throughout His mortal life our Lord frequently elevated His thoughts to God in submission, expressing these inner acts by raising His eyes on high, kneeling, weeping, prostrating on the ground (Jn. 11:41; 17:1; Lk. 22:41; Heb. 5:7; Mk. 14:35). In the Passion He elicited the further act of supreme immolation, namely, obedience unto the death of the cross (Lk. 22:42; Phil. 2:8; Heb. 5:8).

In the Eucharistic sacrifice the action of the Jews in killing Christ is not present, but the actions of Christ as He offered and immolated Himself are there.³¹ He wills to give His Body now as He gave it then (Lk. 22:19), a pleasing sacrifice to the Father (Eph. 5:2), whose glory was in His mind at the Last Supper (Jn. 17:1). The immolation-will of Christ appears in His own words of the double consecration, the showing of His death. In His human nature He died, going out of this world to the Father, who is greater than He (Jn. 14:28). Hence although in His glorified life He cannot suffer, or die, or be changed, He does lower Himself in the twofold consecration, which in sacrificial language means supreme obeisance. There is no need of a physical kenosis of Christ to save the reality of His Eucharistic immolation. Both internally and externally He prostrates before the Father, lowering Himself in the manner proper to sacrifice.

TYPES OF PAST AND FUTURE WORSHIP

The interior sacrifice of homage and obeisance which we have been describing is common to all sacrifices; for of every sacrifice we read that it stands for some cult, intention of adoration, thanksgiving, request, or propitiation (Lev. 1:2; 3:1; 4:2 ff.; 7:12,16). But there are certain sacrifices that have another meaning also, referring not only to present, but also to other worship of past or future.

³¹ St. Albert the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas commenting on 4 Sent. d. 12. q. 3; Swaby, *The Last Supper and Calvary*, pp. 75 ff. Even the ancient sacrifices represented not merely an absent worship of past or future, but also the then present worship of the chosen people (*Summa Theologica*, 1. 2. q. 102. a. 3).

Like the manifold sense of Scripture, this multiple symbolism is not confusing. A sign that stands for several unrelated or opposed realities is bewildering, like a road signal pointing in several directions or a trumpet call whose note is uncertain. There is no trouble, however, when a sign stands for several things so interrelated as to form one thought. Thus the flag of the United States expresses the union of the States in past, present and future: the thirteen stripes signify the union of the thirteen original States, the forty-eight stars the union of the States today, and the constellation grouping suggests the union as a permanent confederation in the future. Again there is no obscurity in the triple symbolism of the sacraments, which looks backward to their origin in the past, expresses their activity in the present and foreshadows their consummation in the future; for the central thought of sanctification unifies all.³² It should not cause us surprise, then, if the sacrifices of the Bible also have a multiple signification. We speak only of authoritative meanings, not of the accommodated explanations which mystical writers assign to ceremonial, as when the Mass is made to picture every prominent event in the life of Christ. From the literal and typical sense of Scripture we have it that sacrifices themselves are signs not merely of the present worship of the soul which the acts of the body visualize, but also of worship offered in the past, or to be offered in the future.³³ There were commemorative sacrifices, like those of the Pasch, which kept alive the memory of a former benefit. There were also prefigurative sacrifices, like those of the Covenant and Atonement, which held before the mind the promise of something to come. But always the reality represented had to do with worship; one sacrifice represented another sacrifice of the past or future.

COMMEMORATION

In the Old Law the chief commemorative sacrifice was that of the Passover or Pasch held annually in memory of the two great events of the liberation of Israel from Egypt and its covenant with God at Sinai as the chosen people (Ex. 12:40; 41:51). God Himself commanded the rite to be kept in memory of what He had done for the people: "This is the observable night of the Lord, when He brought them forth out of the land of Egypt.

³² *Summa Theologica*, 3. q. 60. a. 3.

³³ *Summa Theologica*, 1. 2. q. 102. a. 3.

This night all the children of Israel must observe in their generations" (Ex. 13:42). In the New Law the commemorative sacrifice is the Mass. It also recalls two great events, the unbloody sacrifice which Christ offered at the Last Supper, the night before He departed from this mortal life, and the bloody sacrifice offered in His Passion (1 Cor. 10:14-22; Heb. 9:26; 13:10).

Our Lord commanded the Mass to be celebrated in memory of Himself and His death: "This do for a commemoration of me" (Lk. 22:19); "As often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until He come" (1 Cor. 11:26).

The Mass is therefore the Christian Pasch (1 Cor. 5:7), and very appropriately it was instituted at the Paschal Supper in fulfillment of the latter (Lk. 22:8, 15-16). There are striking resemblances in the two commemorative sacrifices, both as regards the things commemorated and the manner of commemoration.

The Pasch commemorated the inaugural Passover held in Egypt the night before the people departed from the house of bondage and were saved from death by the blood of the lamb.

The Mass recalls the inaugural Mass celebrated by Christ at the Last Supper the night before He died to save mankind by the blood of His cross.

The distinctive Passover rite included two features, the sacrifice of the lamb with the sprinkling of its blood, which on the night of deliverance had been poured on the door-posts, and the sacred family meal at which the body of the lamb was eaten with unleavened bread and cups of wine (Ex. 12:7,46 ff.; 24:6-8; Deut. 16:5). The Mass also retains the outward character of the Last Supper, the showing forth of the death of the Lord, and the communion-banquet, just as the Paschal feast of the Jews repeated the acts and ceremonies which their ancestors had performed on the night of the Exodus.

In both the Pasch and the Mass one and the same rite, the showing of death, expressed not only present worship but also the worship of the past.³⁴ The words of consecration of the Mass, it is true, bear a present-tense wording and meaning in the Greek (ἐστιν, διδόμενον, ἐκχυννόμενον), and in Lk. 22:20 the pouring of

³⁴ *Summa Theologica*, 1. 2. q. 102. a. 2.

the blood is related to the chalice. Nevertheless since our Lord instituted at the Last Supper a memorial of the pouring of blood on the cross, His words included a relation to the then imminent event of the bloody sacrifice.³⁵

Moreover since the Mass has the same Priest and Victim who offered Himself once for ever on the Cross (Heb. 7:27; 9:28), the internal sacrifice of the Mass is not a new and distinct offering made to God as if Calvary did not suffice. It is rather the application down the ages "for many unto remission of sins" (Mk. 14:24; Mt. 26:28) of what was once offered for the human race on the cross.³⁶ The Mass is thus essentially a commemorative sacrifice. But unlike the Passover it is not a *bare* memorial, since in the Mass there is ever the same Priest and Offering as in the sacrifice it commemorates.

FORESHADOWING

While a few sacrifices were instituted to commemorate the past, many were appointed as figures of things to come. And since the substance surpasses the figure, we might expect that the worship to come would not only be more perfect than that which preceded it, but would have been intended before it. That which comes last of all should be the best and the first in intention. And in fact there preexisted in God's mind from eternity the archetypes of a perfect heavenly worship, and these were the models of which all earthly sacrifice is a copy (Wisd. 9:8; Heb. 8:5). The sacrifice of Christ and the heavenly kingdom which would be its result were predestined before all ages (Acts 2:23; 5:18; 1 Pet. 1:20; Apoc. 13:8; Mt. 25:24).

But mankind was not introduced at once into the final worship. There was first an age of preparation for the more perfect cult of the last or Messianic era (Jer. 8:10; Mt. 5:17; 1 Cor. 10:11; Heb. 9:10, 26; 10:15; 1 Tim. 4:1, etc.). The coming more perfect worship cast its shadow before. By divine decree it happened that the earlier sacrifices were dim outlines of the very image or reality that came with Christ (Col. 2:17; Heb. 9:23; 10:1).

³⁵ Boland, *Of Mass*, p. 47; Westminster Version of the N. T., III, p. 49; Poelzl-Martindale, *op. cit.*, pp. 53, 54; Lagrange, *Ev. selon S. Luc*, p. 544; Vigouroux, *op. cit.*, VI, p. 1705.

³⁶ Christ is immolated in the Mass in two ways: by the representation of His passion; by the participation of the fruits of His passion (*Summa Theologica*, 3. q. 83. a. 1). See also Council of Trent in Denzinger, Nos. 938, 940.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews this relationship of type and anti-type is explained in illustrations from the tabernacle and the rites of Atonement. The design of the tabernacle was drawn from the model furnished Moses on the mount. In a visible way it expressed the divine plans (Heb. 8:5). The outer and less sacred part of this tent, known as "the Holy place," represented the Old Testament, while the inner and most sacred part of the edifice, "the Holy of Holies," stood for the New Testament and heaven (Heb. 8:2; 9:8). Between the two places was a curtain, to indicate that the Old Testament worship was in itself inefficacious and did not give access to the heavenly presence (Heb. 9:9, 10).³⁷

On ordinary days the Mosaic priests offered sacrifice in the Holy place; but once a year only, and then by the High-Priest alone, was the innermost sanctuary entered for worship. Annually on the Day of Atonement the High Priest went into the Holy of Holies carrying with him blood of immolation performed outside, and with this he sprinkled the place. Then he returned to the people (Ex. 30:7; Lev. 24:8; 16:12 ff.). In all this was prefigured the sacrifice of the cross, wherein Christ, the great High-Priest, having shed His blood in sacrifice, passed beyond the veil of this life into the next world, and offers there His blood for us until He comes again (Mt. 27:51; Heb. 9:11 ff.).

The first age, then, the Old Testament era, was a preparation for Christ. All its sacrifices in one way or another prefigured Him. Christ the Priest was foreshadowed especially by Melchisedech (Ps. 109:4; Heb. 7:1 ff.), Christ the Victim by the paschal lamb (Jn. 1:29; Acts 8:23; 1 Cor. 5:7; 1 Pet. 1:19; Apoc. 5:6). The external features of His sacrifice were imaged in the bread and wine of the Priest-King of Salem, in the Passover ritual, in the Atonement observances (Gen. 14:18; Lk. 22:7-18; Ex. 30:10; Lev. 16:2; Heb. 9:1 ff.). His inner sacrifice was predicted in the offerings of Abel and Isaac (Gen. 4:4; 22:6-7); the effects, in the worship-offerings, sin-offerings, thank-offerings, prayer-offerings of the first seven chapters of Leviticus. All the ancient sacrifices, therefore, though in the literal sense they expressed the homage of the people, typically referred to the future sacrifice of Christ (Cor. 10:11; Col. 2:16; Heb. 10:1).

The better to prepare for the Messianic age, God chose a special people to be His worshippers before a world given over

³⁷ *Summa Theologica*, 1. 2. q. 102. a. 4. ad 4, 6.

to idolatry. Fifty days after the exodus from Egypt a covenant was entered into between God and Israel. They promised to hold Him as their God, to exclusion of all idols, while He promised to have them as His own worshippers and to introduce them into the Land of Chanaan. The sign and seal of this alliance was a sacrifice there held, with whose blood Moses the mediator sprinkled the people saying: "This is the blood of the covenant which God has made with you" (Ex. 24:8; Heb. 9:20).

The ceremonial law to which Israel obligated itself by the Sinai covenant emphasized the social character of sacrifice, the right of God to receive collective and more solemn worship than had been given among the patriarchs by families and clans. It likewise provided for the active participation of the people in the daily, weekly and feast-day worship, of which sacrifice was always the central rite (Ex. 19:6; 24:8; Lev. 23:1; 26:1-2, 12; Num. 16:3; Par. 29:11; Isa. 49:6; 2 Cor. 5:20). By means of the sacrifices, especially that of the Atonement, the memory of Sinai was kept alive and the covenant relationship periodically renewed until the coming of Christ.

During the second age, between the first and second comings of Christ, the good things prefigured before, namely, sacrifices effective of the spiritual benefits of pardon, grace and glory, are an actuality (Heb. 9:11-12). A new covenant, not temporary like that of Sinai, is now in force, and the new people of God includes all nations (Jer. 31:31; Heb. 8:8 ff.). This latest covenant was inaugurated by Christ the Mediator Himself in the sacrifices of the Supper and the Cross with the words: "This is My Blood of the New Covenant poured out for you and for many unto the remission of sins" (Lk. 22:20).

The memorial of this Covenant is the Mass, which also applies down the centuries, until the second coming, the benefits of the once-offered sacrifice of the Cross (1 Cor. 11:23-26). Christ is now also in heaven, having passed behind the veil after His death (Heb. 8:5; 9:24). There He is seated to receive honor (Eph. 1:23; 1 Tim. 3:15; Heb. 1:3; 3:6; 10:12); but He also ministers in the sanctuary by applying for us, as in the Mass, the blood of the cross (Heb. 9:7,2,25; 10:19). There is no ritual sacrifice in heaven, where Christ acts in a temple not made with hands (Heb. 9:24; Apoc. 21:22-23);³⁸ nor does His inner sacrifice above constitute a new sacrifice different from that of the Cross or the

³⁸ Callan, *The Epistles of St. Paul*, vol. 2, p. 405.

Mass, since it is always the same Cross-sacrifice that is applied (Heb. 8:3; 10:12-14).³⁹ The Church Triumphant joins in this worship with the Church Militant (Heb. 12:22-25).

At the close of the last age of the world will come "the day of the Lord," when the dead will rise again and Christ so long hidden behind the veil of the heavenly sanctuary and so long concealed behind Sacramental veils on earth, will appear again visibly in the world, like the High-Priest emerging from the Holy of Holies (Heb. 9:27-28; 10:19). All things will be subjected to Him (1 Cor. 15:28), and Mass, the memorial of His death until His coming, will cease (1 Cor. 11:26). But, as He is a priest forever (Heb. 7:3), He will continue to worship God by an interior oblation and immolation, recognizing God as Lord of all, and subjecting Himself to Him (1 Cor. 15:28).

This final stage of worship after the general resurrection will be more perfect than that of the Mass because beatific and enduring. In the light of the beatific vision God will be seen in Himself face to face, Christ will be present in His own appearance and glory; and faith, images and ceremonies will no longer be necessary (1 Cor. 13:12; 2 Cor. 5:7; Apoc. 22:3-5).⁴⁰ The worship of God in the resurrection, unlike that of earth, will also be unceasing and unending (Apoc. 4:8; Isa. 6:3).

Even the worship Christ now performs in the heavenly sanctuary by applying His sacrifice is less triumphant and less universal than that of the resurrection. Now the sacrifice is offered for sin, then there shall be only the sacrifice of praise; for He will appear at the end of the ages without reference to sin to complete the salvation of those who looked for His coming (Heb. 9:28). Now there is prayer for those who are still in the state of probation; then there will be thanksgiving for those who cannot fall away (Heb. 7:25; Apoc. 5:9; 11:17). Now the worshippers begin to have access to the sanctuary above; then all the saved shall reign in it for the eternities of eternities (Heb. 12:22-25; Apoc. 22:3-5).

³⁹ Sales, *Il N. T. Commentato*, vol. 2, p. 474.

⁴⁰ Vonier, *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, pp. 258 ff.; Friethoff, *De Alma Socia Christi Redemptoris*, pp. 212, 213. "In the state of future happiness the human intellect will see the divine truth in itself intuitively. And hence external cult will not consist in any figure, but only in the praise of God moved by internal knowledge and affection, as is said in Is. 51:3: 'Joy and gladness shall be there, thanksgiving and the voice of praise.'" (*Summa Theologica*, 1. 2. q. 101. a. 2).

The worship, then, of this present age is prior to and less perfect than that which is to come at the end of the ages. Should we regard the present cultus as a figure of the future worship of heaven? Surely not, if *figure* means that the present Covenant and sacrifice, like that of the Mosaic dispensation, is a passing thing that will fade away at the dawn of a new and better covenant. The present Covenant and priesthood are eternal (Heb. 13:20; 7:23 ff.). But in the sense that the Cross and the Mass are pledges of their own future consummation in heaven, they should be regarded as signs of this final objective for which they were instituted.

The Mass-communion, an integral part of the sacrifice, represents what the just are to receive in future reward and happiness. It is the *earnest* or foretaste of that new wine and heavenly banquet promised at the Last Supper which Christ will give to His followers on that great day when He makes them sit down with Him in the kingdom of the Father (Mt. 26:28-29; Mk. 14:25).⁴¹ The blessed, indeed, receive their essential happiness now, but their complete beatitude awaits the resurrection (Lk. 23:43; 2 Cor. 5:1; 1 Cor. 15:41 ff.).

The sacrifice as well as the sacrament should signify in a special way the glory to come.⁴² The consecration should represent what the blessed will give to God in the way of worship, praise and thanksgiving. For it shows forth the death of the Lord not merely as a physical happening, but as a sacrificial one, as the Last Will and Testament of Christ, as the New and Eternal Covenant, as the New Atonement Blood poured forth for many unto the remission of sins (Mt. 26:26-29; Mk. 14:22-25; Lk. 22:15-20; 1 Cor. 11:23-27). That sacrificial death is the sign of the future inheritance of the promised land where man is blessed by God and reigns with Him and worships Him forever (Heb. 9:15-18; Apoc. 22:3-5). That atonement blood speaks not only of sin's remission, but of entrance into the heavenly place of worship (Heb. 9:24-28; Apoc. 7:14-15). That covenant seal⁴³ proclaims the full realization in communion with God of the aim of all worship and sacrifice (Jer. 31:31; Heb. 8:8 ff.). "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and He shall dwell with them,

⁴¹ Lagrange, *Ev. selon S. Marc*, p. 356; *Ev. selon S. Luc.*, pp. 543-544.

⁴² Brosnan, *The Sacrifice of the New Law*, p. 205.

⁴³ Merklebach, *Summa Theologiae Moralis*, III, p. 186; Le Camus, *The Life of Christ*, III, pp. 222-223.

and they shall be His peoples, and God Himself shall be with them" (Apoc. 21:3-4).

CONCLUSION

The Fathers of the Church asserted the existence of a spiritual sense in the New as well as in the Old Testament.⁴⁴ They also distinguished between the obscure signification of heavenly things in the *umbra* of the Old Testament and the clearer representation in the *imago* of the New Testament.⁴⁵ The same thought is familiar to the Scholastics, and St. Thomas may be cited as representative: "Lex vetus figura est novae legis, et ipsa nova lex, ut dicit Dionysius, est figura futurae gloriae."⁴⁶

The same principle is applied by the Angelic Doctor to the explanation of the meaning of the ceremonial law and of sacrifice. We think we cannot better close this article on the Mass than by condensing the substance of his thought on this particular point; since it is really a summary of all we have said. It is this:

In the absence of the divine things with which sacrifice is concerned, it is necessary to employ sensible images or figures to represent them. In the Old Testament both the heavenly worship and Christ who is the way to it were still in the future, and both accordingly were prefigured. In the New Testament Christ has come, but heaven itself is not yet present; and therefore we commemorate what pertains to Him in the past and express what is present, while prefiguring what remains to appear. In heaven, where divine truth will be clearly present in itself, there is no need of figures.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Zapletal, *Hermeneutica Biblica*, pp. 53 ff.

⁴⁵ St. Ambrose in Ps. 30, n. 25.

⁴⁶ *Summa Theologica*, 1. q. 1. a. 10; see also *Quodlib.* 7. a. 15, ad 5.

⁴⁷ *Summa Theologica*, 1. 2. q. 101. a. 2; q. 103. a. 3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Theological Works Consulted

- Aquinas, St. Thomas, O. P.: *Summa Theologica*.
- Brosnan, J. B.: *The Sacrifice of the New Law*. London, 1926.
- Billot, L., S. J.: *De Ecclesiae Sacramentis*. Rome, 1914. Vol. 5, pp. 580 ff.
- Billuart, R., O. P.: *Summa S. Thomae*. Paris. Vol. 4, pp. 594 ff.; Vol. 6, pp. 531 ff.
- Catechism of the Council of Trent (English translation). New York, 1923, pp. 223 ff.; 254 ff.
- Catholic Encyclopaedia. New York, 1907. Vol. 10, pp. 10 ff.; Vol. 13, pp. 309 ff.
- Dowd, E. F.: *A Conspectus of Modern Catholic Thought on the Essence of the Eucharistic Sacrifice*. Washington, 1937.
- Denzinger, H.: *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum*. Freiburg, 1908.
- Deikamp-Hoffman: *Theologiae Dogmaticae Manuale*. Paris, 1933. Vol. 2, pp. 341 ff.; Vol. 4, 213 ff.
- De la Taille, M., S. J.: *Catholic Faith in the Holy Eucharist*. Cambridge (England), 1922.
- Gasparri, P.: *The Catholic Catechism* (translation). New York, 1932. Pp. 166 ff.
- Gonet, J. B., O. P.: *Clypeus Theologiae Thomisticae*. Paris, 1876.
- Hugon, E., O. P.: *Tractatus Dogmatici*. Rome, 1920. Vol. 3, pp. 339 ff.; Vol. 4, pp. 340 ff.
- Klein, D., O. F. M.: in *Antonianum*, Apr., 1937, Jan., 1938.
- Lercher, L., S. J.: *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae*. Innsbruck, 1925. Vol. 3, pp. 290 ff.
- Macdonald, A.: *The Sacrifice of the Mass*. London, 1924.
- Merkelbach, B. H., O. P.: *Summa Theologiae Moralis*, Paris, 1932. Vol. 2, pp. 705 ff.; Vol. 3, pp. 248 ff.
- Otten, B. J., S. J.: *Institutiones Dogmaticae*. Chicago, 1922. Vol. 3, pp. 340 ff.; Vol. 5, pp. 514 ff.
- Pohle-Preuss: *Soteriology*. St. Louis, 1919. Pp. 111 ff. *The Sacraments*, St. Louis, 1919. Vol. 2, pp. 273 ff.
- Rupprecht, P., O. S. B.: *Sacrificium Mediatoris*, in *D. Thomas*, June 1931 to Dec. 1933.
- Salmanticenses, O. Carm.: *Cursus Theologicus*. Geneva, 1881. Vol. 16, pp. 323 ff.; Vol. 18, pp. 760 ff.
- Swaby, A., O. P.: *The Last Supper and Calvary*, New York, 1926.
- Tanqueray, A., S. S.: *Synopsis Theologiae*. Paris, 1926. Vol. 2, pp. 517 ff.; Vol. 3, pp. 770 ff.
- Vonier, A., O. S. B.: *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, New York, 1925.

2. Scriptural Works Consulted

- Abingdon Bible Commentary (non-Catholic). New York, 1929.
- Aquinas, St. Thomas, O. P.: *In Omnes S. Pauli Epistolas*. Turin, 1912.
- Boland, Joseph: *Of Mass*. New York, 1923.
- Callan, C. J., O. P.: *Commentaries on the Four Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul*. New York, 1918, 1922, 1930.
- Gore, C. (non-Catholic): *A New Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*. New York, 1928.
- Hastings, James (non-Catholic): *Dictionary of the Bible*. New York, 1904.
- Lagrange, M. J., O. P.: *Commentaries on the Gospels*. Paris, 1920.
- Maas, A. J., S. J.: *Christ in Type and Prophecy*, New York, 1893.
- Messmer, S. G.: *Outlines of Bible Knowledge*. St. Louis, 1927.
- Poelzl-Martindale: *The Passion and Glory of Christ*. New York, 1919.
- Pope, Hugh, O. P.: *The Catholic Students Aids to the Bible*. London, 1926. Vol. 1, pp. 284 ff.
- Prat, F., S. J.: *The Theology of St. Paul*. New York, 1926. Vol. 1.
- Rickaby, Joseph, S. J.: *Scripture Manuals for Catholic Schools*. London, 1913.
- Sales, M. M., O. P.: *Il Vecchio Testamento Commentato*. Turin, 1918. *Il Nuovo Testamento Commentato*. Turin, 1911.
- Seisenberger: *Practical Handbook for the Study of the Bible*. New York, 1925. Pp. 109 ff.
- Spencer, F. A., O. P.: *The New Testament from the Greek*. New York, 1937.
- Thompson, N.: *Verbal Concordance to the New Testament (Rheims)*. Baltimore, 1928.
- Vigouroux, F., S. S.: *Dictionnaire de la Bible*. Paris, 1912.
- Westminster Version of the Scriptures. London, 1913.
- Zapletal, V., O. P.: *Hermeneutica Biblica*. Fribourg, 1908.
- Zorell, F., S. J.: *Lexicon Graecum Novi Testamenti*. Paris, 1931.

JOHN A. MC HUGH, O. P.

THE SEVENTY WEEKS

There is probably no passage of the Old Testament upon which so much labor and ingenuity has been expended as the striking prophecy of the seventy weeks which closes the ninth chapter of the Book of Daniel. Many of the Fathers and not a few Catholic apologists down to our own time consider it a Messianic prophecy accurately defining the time of Christ's Redemption. Unfortunately they differ widely in their method of computing the seventy weeks.

In modern times a radically different conception of the prophecy has found favor among most non-Catholic scholars. In their opinion the seventy weeks culminate in the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes in the Maccabean age. Even some Catholic scholars of note have adopted this view.¹ Moreover new theories have been proposed with regard to the date of Esdras and Nehemias which are not without an important bearing on the chronology of the seventy weeks. For these reasons it will be not altogether amiss to reexamine this fascinating but elusive prophecy.

We shall first give a translation from the Hebrew adding a few philological notes explaining our version. Then we shall discuss the current twofold interpretation of the prophecy: the Maccabean and the directly Messianic. The conclusion will embody the results of our investigation and comparison.

THE TRANSLATION

A few preliminary remarks on the setting are almost indispensable. Daniel is reflecting on the seventy years of desolation predicted for the holy city by Jeremias. This prompts him to confess the sins of the people and to pray for mercy and the promised salvation (9:1-19). In answer to his prayer the angel Gabriel appears to him and grants him the following revelation:

9:24. Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish apostasy and to fill up the measure of transgression and to pardon iniquity; and to bring in everlasting justice and to seal vision and prophet and to anoint a holy of holies.

¹ Lagrange, *Revue Biblique*, 1930; Riessler, *Daniel*; Szczgiel, *Theologie und Glaube*, XV, pp. 268-283; Bigot, *Daniel* in *Diction. de Theol. Cathol.*; Göttberger, *Daniel*.

9:25. Know, then, and understand: from the going forth of a decree to restore and build Jerusalem to an Anointed, a Prince, there shall be seven weeks. And for sixty-two weeks it shall be built again with broad place and moat, but in tribulation of times.

9:26. And after sixty-two weeks an Anointed shall be cut off, although there shall be no guilt in him; and the people of a prince that is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary, but his end shall be in an overwhelming flood, and up to the end there shall be war; that which is determined of desolations.

9:27. And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week; and for half of the week he shall cause sacrifice and meal-offering to cease; and in its stead shall be an abomination which appalls; even until fully determined destruction shall be poured out upon that which appalls.

PHILOLOGICAL NOTES

9:24. שבעים: an unusual form of the plural chosen, perhaps, to indicate that periods of seven years are meant.

נִחַתָּה; it means "cut off, determine, decree." The Vulgate's "abbreviatae sunt" must be understood in the sense of "cut off," i. e., mentally separated from the cycle of years, and so determined. Taken in any other meaning it is erroneous.

לִבְלֹא: "to restrain sin in its activity." But the following verbs do not permit us to adopt this translation. Hence it has been treated as equivalent to לְבַלֵּא or לְבַלֹּת, to finish sin.

לְהַתֵּם: so the Kethibh: "to seal up sin." But this would mean that the sins are to be kept in secure restraint so that none might possibly be overlooked on the day of judgment. But the tenor of the passage, which speaks of pardon, is against this interpretation. Hence the Kere לְהַתֵּם has been preferred: "to complete sin" or "to fill up the measure of transgression."

הַטָּאוֹת; Kere, הַטָּאָה. But there is no reason to prefer Kere.

9:25. The Massorettes placed a disjunctive Athnach under שְׁבַע separating the seven from the sixty-two weeks. Grammatically there is no objection to disregarding the Massoretic punctuation and combining seven with sixty-two. Both modes of interpretation will be discussed below.

9:26. לִי. An indefinite subject: "something" or "someone" is understood in this enigmatic sentence which is a crux of interpreters. The sense,

then, is that the Anointed, when he is cut off will be without something or someone. Theodotion understood the "something" to be *κρίμα*, translating: *καὶ κρίμα οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ*, "And there is no guilt in him." This suggestion has been adopted above. Others translate: "and he will have no successor." Applied to Onias it signifies that he will not have a legitimate successor. See discussion below.

וְהָעִיר וְהַקֹּדֶשׁ יִשְׁחִית עִם נָגִיד הָבָא : עֵם may be read instead of עֵם and יִשְׁחִית in place of יִשְׁחִית. The clause then may be rendered: The city and the sanctuary will be destroyed with the prince or like the prince. The Vulgate has a conflate text retaining both עֵם and עִם.

וְקִצּוֹ: the pronominal suffix may also possibly be referred to "the city and the sanctuary," its gender being accounted for by attraction to the latter antecedent.

9:27. לְרַבִּים: "The many." But by vocalizing: לְרַבִּים: "many" שְׁבוּעָאֶחָד: may mean: "for one week" or "in the course of one week."

חֲצִי: signifies either: "in the middle of the week" or "for one half of the week."

עַל כִּנָּף: We may translate: 1) "Upon the wing of abominations comes the desolator." Thus the heathen foe is conceived as riding against the sanctuary upon a winged creature symbolizing the abominations of paganism. But this concept is too poetical for the prosaic character of the prophecy. 2) "Upon the wing shall be an abomination which appalls." The wing is thought to be some elevated part of the Temple buildings, analogous to the pinnacle of Herod's Temple (Mt. 4:5; Lk. 4:9). But it is doubtful whether כִּנָּף had this sense. 3) "In its stead shall be the abomination which appalls." This supposes the emendation כִּנָּף to כִּנּוּ. It seems the most reasonable suggestion.

שְׁמוֹת שְׁמַיִם: most probably should be read שְׁמוֹת שָׁמַיִם as in 11:31 and 12:11. Like the Hebrew בִּשְׁמַיִם, שְׁמוֹת שָׁמַיִם is most likely a surrogate for כְּעֵל in certain proper names. Ishbosheth (2 Sam. 2:8) is a play on the Phoenician שָׁמַיִם (heavens). The whole phrase, then, is a contemptuous allusion to the Baal of the Heavens or the Zeus Olympios honored in the Temple by command of Antiochus Epiphanes.

עַל-שְׁמַיִם: we may translate: 1) "upon that which appalls," 2) "upon him who appalls or desolates," 3) "upon that which is desolated" or "desolate." Our preference will be determined by the context.

THE MACCABEAN INTERPRETATION

Let us now examine the prophecy, sentence by sentence, to see whether it can be rationally interpreted of the Maccabean age.

24. All critics are agreed that the seventy weeks cannot be ordinary weeks but must be seventy periods of seven years each. For it is impossible to find any epoch in Jewish history, lasting but 490 days, in which the events narrated could possibly be verified.

The three negative and the three positive blessings which are to ensue upon the expiration of the seventy weeks are indubitably Messianic. The negative blessings are: the cessation of apostasy, the filling up of the measure of sin, and the pardon of iniquity. On the positive side it is predicted that everlasting righteousness shall prevail, that both prophets and their visions shall receive the seal of divine approval, doubtless through the fulfillment of their predictions, and that a holy of holies shall be anointed.

There is some controversy about the meaning of the "holy of holies." This term is a form of the Hebrew superlative denoting a most holy thing. In the Old Testament it is applied to various objects consecrated to the divine service but very rarely to persons. The only ones so designated are slaves dedicated to the service of the sanctuary (Lev. 27:28). The passage in which the term seems to be applied to Aaron and his sons is corrupt (1 Par. 23:13).²

It seems certain, then, that "holy of holies" in this verse, contrary to the translation of the Vulgate (*Sanctus sanctorum*), does not represent a particular person. But what is the most holy object intended? Some think that it is the altar of holocausts which was profaned by Antiochus Epiphanes. This altar was dismantled by Judas Maccabaeus and a new one was erected in its place. (164 B. C. 1 Mach. 4:36-60).

But since all the other characteristics of the age depicted in this verse (24) are Messianic, it seems more probable that there is a reference to the ideal Temple which Ezechiel describes in great detail and which he calls a "holy of holies" (43:12; 45:3; 48:12). There can be no doubt that this temple symbolically represents the Church of Christ. Both St. Peter (1 Pet. 2:5)

² "And Aaron was separated to sanctify it as a thing most holy, he and his sons" (Corrected text).

and St. Paul picture the Church as a temple (2 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 2:21).

The expression "anoint" is obviously no objection to taking "holy of holies" in a spiritual sense. Besides signifying the material anointing with sacred oil, it also has a derived sense of consecrating, dedicating.

But if the initial verse of the prophecy directly refers to the Messianic era, does it follow that the seventy weeks must terminate in this period? No, because the angel does not say that these Messianic blessings will follow immediately upon the close of the seventy weeks. They are represented as a necessary prelude to the Messianic age which may succeed immediately or after an interval.

In 25-27, the seventy weeks are resolved into three periods of seven, sixty-two and one week respectively.

25a. The first seven weeks are described thus: "from the going forth of a decree to restore and build Jerusalem to an Anointed, a Prince, there shall be seven weeks." Since Daniel received his vision while meditating on the seventy years foretold by Jeremias, it is reasonable to suppose that the date of this prophecy is the terminus a quo of the seven weeks. This prediction was first made in 604 (25:11 ff.) and repeated about 594 with the promise that the deported Jews would be restored to their native land (29:11). About 588 Jeremias prophesied the restoration and rebuilding of Jerusalem (30:18; 31:38). In 586 Jerusalem was destroyed by the Chaldeans and the bulk of its inhabitants was deported to Babylonia. The promise of restoration may be considered as having been tacitly repeated at this time, although it is not again recorded in Jeremias. Hence the terminus a quo is either 588 or 586.

The terminus ad quem is an Anointed, a Prince. According to some this is Josue, the highpriest, who returned with the exiles from Babylonia in 538. More probably however, Cyrus, the Persian king, is meant. In Isaias God calls him "My anointed" (45:1) and declares that he will give command for the building of Jerusalem (44:26; 44:28; 45:13). Between 588 or 586 and 538, the year of Cyrus' edict permitting the return of the Jews, there are approximately forty-nine years or seven weeks.

25b. The second period of the seventy weeks is related thus: "And for sixty-two weeks it shall be built again with broad place and moat." Jerusalem, then, shall be built again in the course of

434 years and shall remain in this state. The broad place represents the open spaces usually found inside the gates of ancient Oriental cities. It stands metaphorically for the interior of the city. The moat is the trench dug around the city for purposes of defense. Figuratively it represents all the outer fortifications of the city. Both terms together succinctly picture the city as completely restored. The tribulations were caused by the Samaritans and other hostile neighboring nations who tried to prevent the complete restoration of Jerusalem.

26a. The initial event of the third and last period, consisting of one week, is recounted thus: "And after sixty-two weeks an Anointed shall be cut off, although there shall be no guilt in him." This Anointed is Onias III, a noble character and the legitimate highpriest who was deposed by Antiochus Epiphanes in 175 B. C., and replaced by his brother, Jason, who favored the Hellenizing policy of the king. By intrigue and bribery, Menelaus, a Benjaminite, ousted Jason and secured the highpriestly dignity for himself. At the instigation of Menelaus, Onias was foully assassinated in 170 at Antioch in Syria.

26b. The following words depict the havoc wrought by the troops of Antiochus in Jerusalem and its Temple during the sanguinary persecution of the Jews which he inaugurated in 167: "And the people of a prince that is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary."

26c. "But his end shall be in an overwhelming flood." This refers to the miserable death of Antiochus at Gabae (Ispahan) in Media on his return from a military expedition to the East. The overwhelming flood is the outpouring of the divine wrath to which it was due (1 Mach. 6:8 ff; 2 Mach. 9:2 ff).

"And up to the end there shall be war;—that which is determined of desolations." Up to the end of the last week war will be waged against the Jews with its concomitant horrors as decreed by the divine counsels.

27. The final verse relates the events of the last week more in detail: "And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week; and for half of the week he shall cause sacrifice and meal-offering to cease; and in its stead shall be an abomination which appalls; even until fully determined destruction shall be poured out upon that which appalls." The strong covenant is the bargain which Antiochus made with his Jewish partisans to diffuse Greek culture among the Jews with the ultimate purpose of detaching

them from their ancestral customs and religion. This policy of Hellenization was begun in 170. In 167 or at the beginning of the second half of the final week, Antiochus inaugurated a brutal persecution of the Jews opposed to Hellenism. The Temple was rededicated to Zeus Olympios. All the Mosaic sacrifices were completely suspended. A Greek altar was erected upon the old altar of holocausts, and pigs were immolated upon it. An image of Zeus Olympios bearing, it would appear, the features of Antiochus himself was set up in the Temple. These pagan profanations were the abomination which appalls. This deplorable desecration endured from 167 to 164, or the latter half of the last week. In 164 Judas regained possession of the Temple area, removed all the emblems of paganism, and rededicated the Temple. Thus destruction was poured upon that which was appalling at the close of the last week.

The prophecy, therefore, can be reasonably explained if we assume that it culminates in the Maccabean age. But there is one apparently serious difficulty. From 538, the date of the edict of Cyrus, until 170, the year of the death of Onias, there are not 434 years but 368 so that the number assigned in the prophecy is too large by 66. Does this seeming chronological error compel us to reject the Maccabean interpretation? Consideration of the probable reason why the author chose to express the period of time by seventy weeks may show us that this difficulty is not insurmountable. On account of their sins the Jews were condemned to seventy years of exile. But even after their restoration they continued to offend God. Now Leviticus threatens the Israelites with sevenfold punishment in the case of obstinate persistence in rebellion (26:18-24). In accordance with this threat the angel answers the inquiring Daniel that the punishment of his people will be, not seventy years, but seventy times seven or seventy weeks of years. Having once chosen this sacred number it was possible for him to express the first and final periods accurately in terms of years but not the intervening period. This period, therefore, of sixty-two weeks may not be destined to be computed exactly but to be taken as an approximate number.

THE MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION

Let us now see whether the prophecy is susceptible of a direct Messianic interpretation. This requires a few slight alterations in the version of 9:25-27.

9:25. From the going forth of a decree to restore and build Jerusalem to an Anointed, a Prince, there shall be seven weeks and sixty-two weeks. It shall be built again with broad place and moat but in tribulation of times.

9:26. And after sixty-two weeks an Anointed shall be cut off, although there shall be no guilt in him; and with the Prince that is to come shall be destroyed the city and the sanctuary, and its end shall be in an overwhelming flood, and up to the end there shall be war;—that which is determined of desolations.

9:27. And he shall make a firm covenant with the many in the course of one week; and in the middle of the week he shall cause sacrifice and meal-offering to cease; and upon the wing shall be an abomination which appalls; until fully determined destruction shall be poured out upon that which is desolate.

It is universally admitted that in the exclusively Messianic interpretation two series of events are narrated: the achievements of the Messiah and the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 A. D. We shall first discuss the statements relating to the Messiah.

The seventy weeks are divided into two periods consisting respectively of sixty-nine weeks and one week. From the issue of a decree for the rebuilding of Jerusalem to an Anointed, a Prince, there are said to be sixty-two and seven weeks. Why the sixty-nine weeks should be so oddly expressed cannot be adequately explained. The terminus ad quem may be taken to be Christ who is both an Anointed and a king. But is there a decree to rebuild Jerusalem between which and the advent of Christ there is an interval of 483 years? The date of the prophecy about the seventy years as well as that of the edict of Cyrus obviously does not meet the requirements. Equally unsatisfactory is the edict promulgated in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes I (465-424). An attempt has been made to prove that he really began to reign in 474, but without success.³

The only decree which gives the desired result is that issued by Artaxerxes I, in the seventh year of his reign, to Esdras (458). But an unbiassed inspection of this decree reveals that it contains nothing about rebuilding Jerusalem, if we take the word in its proper, literal sense. Esdras is authorized to lead back colonists to Jerusalem, to make certain expenditures for the Tem-

³ Maas, *Christ in Type and Prophecy*, I, p. 319.

ple and the cultus, and to appoint judges to administer the religious law for the Jews of Syria. At most this may be termed restoring and rebuilding Jerusalem in a broad, figurative sense (Esdr. 7:12 ff).

Assuming that this sense is legitimate and counting 483 years from 458 we arrive at 26 A. D. Whether this year coincides with the date of Christ's Baptism or the beginning of his public life is open to serious dispute. The most that we can gather from the passage is that Christ will appear in or after 26 A. D.

There is another weighty objection against taking 458 as the terminus a quo of the sixty-nine weeks. Van Hoonacker and other distinguished scholars⁴ maintain, not without good arguments, that Nehemias preceded Esdras and that the latter received his edict from Artaxerxes II (404-359). If this is true, then the Messianic interpretation of vv 25-27 becomes utterly impossible.

Without pressing this difficulty we shall continue to assume that 458 is the correct starting point. We are told that after sixty-two weeks an Anointed will be cut off. This must signify that the death of Anointed will occur after the completion of the sixty-two weeks which follow the previously mentioned seven weeks. Otherwise the event cannot be verified. But even so the datum remains loose and inexact. It is practically certain that Christ did not die in 26 A. D. The statement, then, must be interpreted to mean that Christ will die some time after 26 A. D., although this is not the natural sense of the words.

In v. 27 we read that "he will make a firm covenant, with the many in the course of one week." We may take "the many" or the multitude as denoting all mankind. The passage may be understood as referring to the new covenant founded by Christ.

It is said that "in the middle of the week he will cause sacrifice and meal-offering to cease." We may interpret this of the total abolition of the Old Testament sacrifices effected by the death of Christ upon the cross. But when did Christ die? The probable years are: 30 and 33 A. D. and of these 30 is slightly more probable. Now 30 A. D. happens to be the middle year of the last week (26-33).

But the phrase may also be translated "in the course of the half of the week." If the first half is intended, some year of the

⁴ Raffini, *Chronologia*, p. 40; Pelt, *Histoire*, p. 385 ff; Touzard, *Revue Biblique* (1915).

interval, 26-30, is indicated. But if the second half is meant, it will be found in the period: 30-33 A. D.

The fact that this mode of computing the 70 weeks brings us close to the probable date of the crucifixion obviously is no guarantee that it is correct. It may be due to pure coincidence, especially since we are far from certain that we are justified in using 458 as the terminus a quo.

The remaining passages may without difficulty be applied to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. It is difficult to understand why this event should be referred to at all, since it does not come within the limits of the 70 weeks. Mention of it may be defended on the ground that a causal connection subsists between the judicial murder of Christ and the rejection and fate of the Jews.

In v. 26, it is said that the city and sanctuary will suffer a fate similar to that of Christ and that their end will be in a flood of divine wrath. Up to the last days of the city there will be war with the accompanying horrors decreed by God.

Further references are found in v. 27: "Upon the wing shall be an abomination which appalls." Upon some part of the Temple, known as the wing or pinnacle, idolatrous symbols will be set up. These will remain until complete ruin has overtaken the desolate city.

CONCLUSION

The writer has striven to expound the advantages and disadvantages in each mode of interpretation. He does not care to decide categorically the delicate problem as to which system is to be preferred. *Salvo meliore iudicio*, it seems to him that the Maccabean interpretation is more unified and less subject to chronological difficulties. If any one should wish to adopt it, he need not fear that he will contradict the teaching of the Fathers. As Lagrange has shown,⁵ a unanimous consent of the Fathers, if we except v. 24, on the exclusively Messianic character of this prophecy does not exist. In both interpretations v. 24 must be admitted as Messianic.

A saying of Christ quoted by St. Matthew and St. Mark may give us pause: "When, therefore, you shall see the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place, he that readeth let him understand; then

⁵ *Revue Biblique*, 1930, p. 193.

they that are in Judea, let them flee to the mountains" (Mt. 24: 14,15; Mk. 13:14). The expression "abomination of desolation" occurs thrice in Daniel (11:31; 12:11; 9:27). In 11:31 and 12:11 it refers to the profanation of the sanctuary by Antiochus. It is not clear, then, to which particular passage our Lord is alluding. Most probably he is not speaking of the precise abomination predicted by Daniel but of one analogous to it and possibly typifying it. Consequently this allusion does not prove that our prophecy is exclusively Messianic.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Bigot, "Daniel," *Dictionnaire de Theol. Cath.*

Boutflower: *In and around the Book of Daniel* (London: S. P. C. K., 1923).

Charles, *Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929).

Corluy, *Spicilegium* (Ghent. Poelman, 1884), I. pp. 475 ff.

Goettsberger, *Daniel* (Bonn: Harstein, 1928).

Hontheim, "Das Todesjahr Christi," *Katholik*, 1906.

Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in Daniele* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1891).

Koenig, *Messianischen Weisagungen* (Stuttgart: Belser, 1925).

Legrange, J. M., "La Prophetie des Soixante Dix Semaines," *Revue Biblique*, 1930, p. 179.

Maas, *Christ in Type and Prophecy* (New York: Benziger, 1893) Vol. I, pp. 299 ff.

Montgomery, *Daniel* (New York: Schribner, 1927).

Szyzgiel, "Von den Perioden der Wochen-Prophetie," *Theologie und Glaube*, XV, pp. 268 ff.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S. J.

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

A volume of over 300 large pages represents the labor of many years by the Fourth Abbot of Downside, the distinguished Benedictine, Dom John Chapman.¹ It is a posthumous work, which the learned Msgr. Barton has put together from many hundreds of pages fairly well completed and written in the Abbot's own hand on the literary relations between our first three Gospels. The author had intended to add a fourth part on St. John, but in this labor he did not get beyond notes which are too fragmentary for reproduction. Since this work is dealing with the Synoptic Problem, it is needful at the outset to recall ever so briefly the main outlines of that vexing question.

Our first three Gospels are termed *synoptics*, not because they give us a synopsis or summary of our Lord's life, but because they treat the facts and events of the marvelous earthly years of the God-Man from the same general viewpoint. Synopsis is a Greek word which in its literal or primary meaning signifies *looking at together*, that is, comparing two or more things one with the other. If we look thus at our first three Gospels, especially when arranged in parallel columns, we are at once impressed with their striking similarities, on the one hand, and their not less remarkable differences, on the other hand. Now they are identical, then very much alike, and again totally different. These likenesses and differences run to a great extent all through these three sacred books, but in general they may be arranged or grouped under the following heads: language and style, the facts narrated, the order of the facts. The resemblances and divergencies we here encounter are often found where we should least expect them, and are made all the more astonishing when we remember that the Jewish writers of these Gospels are reporting in Greek what our Lord said in Aramaic. These authors, writing at different times and for different readers, amid very different circumstances, and for purposes widely divergent, are often so much alike as to use at times, and for long spaces, not only identical words but the same minute Greek particles. On the contrary, they are often remarkably unlike

¹ Matthew, Mark and Luke. A Study in the Order and Interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels. By the late Dom John Chapman, O. S. B. Edited with an Introduction and some additional matter by Msgr. John M. T. Barton, D. D.

when reporting the simplest though most extraordinary matters, such as the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer, the Institution of the Eucharist, the Inscription on the Cross. What was it that made them so much alike on different topics, and so very different when narrating the same happenings or sayings? How explain such likenesses and unlikenesses just when we should least expect to find them? This is the Synoptic Problem.

Before glancing at the principal theories which have been formulated to solve this question it will be interesting to observe what we may call two strangely different attitudes on the part of scholars down to recent times. The first is that this problem was noticed almost from the beginning of the written Gospels. The first three records were observed to have much in common, as well as many differences; and Mark was less generally known and used than the other two in the early centuries because it was noticed that his whole contents, except some sixty verses, were to be found in Matthew and Luke. St. Augustine actually wrote a special treatise on the harmony of the Gospels, entitled, *De Consensu Evangelistarum*. Many other Fathers likewise have left ample testimony concerning the origin and relationship of our four Gospels. While it is true that they have bequeathed to us no developed theory for the solution of our special question, we can nevertheless gather from their combined writings the following important conclusions: (a) the first and fourth Gospels were written by Apostles, and the second and third by followers of the Apostles; (b) the chronological order of the Gospels was Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; (c) Matthew's Gospel was first written in the Hebrew dialect, known as Palestinian Aramaic; (d) Matthew's Greek Gospel was substantially identical with its Aramaic original.

Such, in a word, was the attitude of the Fathers concerning the origin and relations of our Gospels, and it is just what might be expected. But it is a matter of surprise that in the post-Patristic period, all down the centuries to modern times, scholars should have shown so little concern about this arresting question. Even the late Professor Swete, in spite of his eminence as a student and authority on New Testament literature, passed over the question as if it either did not exist, or was of no great moment. However this indifference may be explained, it is encouraging to note that in our own times the Synoptic Problem has been more and more engaging the attention of schol-

ars. The results of their studies may be gathered from a look at the principal theories they have given us. These are: Oral Tradition, Mutual or Successive Dependence, and Written Sources. A few words about each one.

The Theory of Oral Tradition.—This hypothesis has been a favorite one with non-Catholics and has also been extensively used by such leading Catholic authorities as Schegg, Kaulen, Fouard, Fillion, Knabenbauer, Cornely, Cornely-Hagen, and LeCamus. We are reminded here, in the first place, that the Gospel was preached before it was committed to writing, and that the preaching of the Apostles would naturally center on the public life of our Lord—His teaching, miracles, passion, death, and resurrection. And it is very likely that, before going out to deliver to the world the Good Tidings of Redemption, the Apostles would have determined on the substance of their messages. The main body of their doctrine being thus the same would tend to become fixed, and the proverbially retentive Oriental memory would pass it on practically unchanged to their successors. In fact, St. Luke, in the prologue to his Gospel seems to say that the principal source of the Gospels was the tradition of the Apostles, and Patristic tradition tells us that Mark has given us the Gospel preached by Peter, and Luke the Gospel delivered by Paul. In this way we can account for the likenesses of the Synoptics. Their differences, on the other hand, can be explained by the linguistic, geographic, national and other differences of the readers for whom the synoptists wrote.

This Theory of Oral Tradition has doubtless much in its favor, and yet it is inadequate for several reasons. (a) Why have the Synoptics given us practically only the same meager accounts out of the abundant material of our Lord's words and deeds which oral tradition certainly preserved and handed down? (b) How could a tradition dependent on memory alone account for the strange sameness of order discernible in the Synoptic writers, each of whom repeatedly breaks the common thread of thought only to resume it later at the very point where he broke it? (c) How could an oral tradition primitively in Aramaic explain the strange coincidences in the Greek wording of our Gospels? And if it be said that the Aramaic tradition was early put into Greek, how then explain the strange differences of the Greek of very important passages, as cited above?

The Theory of Mutual or Successive Dependence.—This theory is traced back to St. Augustine and is still held in high esteem by Catholics, as well as many non-Catholics of the present day. It explains the similarities of the Synoptic Gospels by the dependence which the second had on the first, and which the third had on the first and second. Their differences are accounted for by the personal knowledge of each evangelist and his independent use of other written and oral sources of information. Of course this hypothesis has as many varying forms as there are different opinions concerning the order in which the Gospels were written, but its usual form is as follow: Matthew wrote first a Gospel in Aramaic; Mark used this Gospel for his own; then a Greek translation of Matthew was made in substantial conformity with the Aramaic, but dependent on Mark to some extent; finally, Luke wrote following Mark closely, but—according to some of the patrons of this theory—depending on Matthew in a measure.

Of this Theory Msgr. Barton well says:

In whatever form the hypothesis of successive dependence is accepted, it is evident that it is eminently traditional and, at the same time, critical. . . . It affords a reasonable explanation of those minute *similarities* in the Synoptic Gospels which otherwise seem to be incapable of elucidation; and it also accounts for the undoubted fact that the later Gospels depend upon the earlier. The *differences* in the Synoptic narrative may be explained partly by variations in the oral *catechesis*, partly by the individual style, purpose, and personality of the respective authors (p. xxii).

And yet, when all this has been admitted, we are constrained to say that the Theory of Mutual Dependence satisfies our question only in part.

If Mark borrowed from Matthew, why has he omitted all about the birth and infancy of our Lord? And how explain his manifest stamp of originality? If Luke had Matthew before him, how can we account for his strikingly different geneology of our Lord, for his failure to relate the visit of the Magi, his variations in the account of the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer, etc.? If Mark was the original, as many non-Catholic scholars now hold, where did Matthew and Luke get the great amount of matter which they each contain independently of their supposed source? Similar difficulties will be found in this theory no matter what order we give to the Synoptics. There is in each of them too much of individual peculiarity in facts, events, arrangement, language and style, to be entirely explained by the Theory of Mutual or Successive Dependence. (Callan, *The Four Gospels*, p. xxvii).

The Theory of Written Sources.—To be very brief, this theory, which is supported by a great number of non-Catholic scholars, in its present and most acceptable form, postulates as the principal sources of Matthew and Luke two documents: (a) our canonical Mark, and (b) a “sayings” source, commonly identified with the *Logia* of Papias, and known as *Quelle* or *Q*, a German term for *sources*. Dr. Streeter has added to these sources two others, one called *M*, which entered into the composition of Matthew, and the other called *L*, on which St. Luke drew for his Gospel. In this way for him the Theory of Written Sources becomes a four-document hypothesis. This theory, it is claimed, perfectly explains the contents of our Synoptic Gospels, which are made up of two groups of elements: (a) narratives of events and actions, found in all three Gospels; and (b) Christ’s teachings, which are contained only in Matthew and Luke.

In spite of the plausibility of the Theory of Written Sources, it fails to explain too many essential points to be entirely acceptable. Its main defects are: (a) it sets aside tradition in placing Mark before Matthew; (b) it denies the very probable dependence of Luke on both Matthew and Mark; (c) it disregards the influence of oral tradition on the composition of each of the Synoptics; (d) it does not explain the total disappearance of the documentary sources on which it largely depends and the silence of contemporary authorities concerning those sources; (e) its advocates cannot agree on the origin, nature and extent, time of composition, historical value, etc., of the *Logian* document which they postulate; (f) it does not explain the compilatory character of Mark’s Gospel.

So much for a brief survey of the principal theories advanced by scholars as more or less satisfactory solutions of our question. Up to 1916 Abbot Chapman was chiefly impressed by what he roughly called the two-document hypothesis. He believed that our Greek Matthew depended on Mark as one source, and on *Q*, or the matter common to Matthew and Luke, as the other source. During the Great War, however, when recovering from illness contracted at the front, he had many leisure hours on his hands and his mind turned quite naturally to his old study. As he pondered it, he could not reconcile the position he had adopted with the certain tradition that Matthew as a whole was written before Mark and that Mark is an extract from Matthew. Upon revolving the question thus in his mind, it seemed that, after all;

the ordinary bases of the two-document theory are just as consistent with the view that the Greek Matthew was first and Mark second, provided Luke is third. All he needed for this conclusion was to find some traces in Mark which would justify it; and this he was surprised to discover in certain notable omissions and passages where Mark seemed to have passed over or summarized large portions of Matthew. Thus if we compare Mk. 4:2 with Mt. 13:3, Mk. 4:33-34 with Mt. 13:34-35, Mk. 12:38 with Mt. 23:1, we shall find very evident gaps. In fact, of the long discourse in Mt. 23:1-39 Mark has only two and a half verses, showing that what would be of interest to Jewish readers in Palestine for whom Matthew wrote would not at all interest Mark's Roman readers. Again, of Matthew's 97 verses in chapters 24 and 25 Mark has in chapter 13 only 37 verses. Again, of the three parables in Mt. 21:28—22:46. Mark has omitted the first and the last, and he introduces his one with the words: "And he began to speak to them in parables."

There are also "instances where Mark taken alone gives no sign of any omission, but where comparison with Matthew suggests it." Thus,

after Mt. 17:22-23=Mk. 9:30-32=Lk. 9:43-45, where Matthew and Mark march together in the usual manner, Matthew interpolates the story of the Didrachma and the Stater in the fish's mouth, after which again the three Gospels agree, Mt. 18:1=Mk. 9:34=Lk. 9:46. But we notice that in Mark there is a half verse, 33^a, which refers to Matthew but has been omitted as unnecessary by Luke (p. 16).

These are the principal specimens of omissions of Matthew by Mark which the Abbot gives in the first two chapters of his book, and when they are carefully examined they do seem to show that one has been copying and abridging the other. But which is which remains the question.

The author has divided his work into three Books. In chapter 3 of the first Book he tries to prove that Matthew is an original work and one of Mark's sources, and in chapter 4 that Mark contains the witness of Peter. The quotations of Matthew by Mark are shown in chapter 7 to be more easily explained if Matthew preceded Mark in composition and was used by him as one of his principal sources. In chapter 8 Mark's style is carefully studied, with the result that the author concludes that Peter is the real author of Mark, that he used Matthew's Greek Gospel as the basis of his instructions, and that Mark took down the discourses exactly as Peter delivered them.

Book II is a detailed study of Luke. In its seven chapters the author arrives at the following important conclusion: (a) the Q hypothesis is impossible; (b) Mathew and Luke had not a common written source; (c) when Luke seems not to follow Mark's order, he is following Matthew's (chapter 11). But in chapter 13, pursuing the study of Luke's use of Mark, he says that Luke regarded Mark as the skeleton of his own work; and in chapter 15 he infers that Luke came in contact with the Greek Matthew only when his own work was far advanced, and he was thus obliged to make excisions in his own MS.

In the third and last Book of this treatise the author studies Matthew's Gospel, and his conclusion in chapters 16 and 17 is that Matthew's Greek Gospel is a faithful translation of the original Aramaic into good Greek of the period. Luke's Sermon on the Plain, he holds, was not derived from Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, nor are both from a single source like Q. In some cases Matthew and Luke seem to have borrowed from an identical source; but at other times they are likely recording words of Christ spoken on different occasions. At any rate, the Q hypothesis is to be rejected. In the final chapter of Book III the Abbot examines the Old Testament quotations found in Matthew, and attempts to show that in some cases at least they are earlier than Mark and were one of his sources.

In sum Dom Chapman's Theory of Successive Dependence amounts to this: (a) As a primary source of their preaching St. Matthew and St. Peter made use of a primitive Aramaic Catechesis; (b) from this resulted first Matthew's Aramaic Gospel; (c) then came Matthew's Greek Gospel, which was substantially the same as its Aramaic original; (d) next from Matthew's Greek Gospel and St. Peter's primitive Aramaic Catechesis came Mark; (e) a first draft of Luke resulted from Mark and Luke's special sources; (f) the final Luke came from Luke No. I plus Luke's special sources plus Matthew's Greek.

Abbot Chapman has left us in this work a profitable study of a difficult question. Doubtless only he could appreciate the full force of some of its unusual conclusions, since an author like himself of high attainments and capabilities is usually the best judge of his own work. Other critics always remain more or less on the outside of the question in hand, if it is an involved and extensive one like the Synoptic Problem, unless they may have written a similar exhaustive treatise on it. It is also doubtless true

that had the author lived to finish his labor and put it together for publication, he would have polished it up in many places and would have removed what at times seem to be discordant positions and conclusions.

But when full allowances have been made for disparity of judgment between an author and his critics and for the posthumous character of this work, it seems to us that even a casual student of this question, when he has examined the Abbot's arguments for the priority of the Greek Matthew to Mark, will be inclined to think that they could be just as well satisfied, at least in most cases, by Mark's use of the Aramaic Matthew, which was admittedly the same in substance as its Greek translation. Why could St. Peter not have had before him the Aramaic Matthew to refresh his memory on partly forgotten events and details? This explanation would suffice just as well as to say he had the Greek Matthew, except in those cases where the Greek of Mark is word for word the same as the Greek Matthew, and even then this identity of language could be explained by saying that Matthew's Greek was copying Mark. Furthermore, we do not see the special advantage of straining to put Matthew's Greek ahead of Mark, so long as we admit, and have to admit, that Matthew's Aramaic Gospel, which was substantially identical with its Greek translation, preceded Mark, and so could have been used by him either directly, or indirectly through St. Peter's preaching. In fact, the Abbot, each time he draws these new conclusions, seems to feel, and often actually says, that another explanation is possible.

Our final impression of this large work, therefore, after a rather hurried study of its contents, is that it hardly carries the weight and sense of conviction which are produced by the Theory of Successive Dependence adopted and perfected by Fr. Vosté, which may be summed up as follows: (a) St. Matthew and St. Peter used in their preaching a primitive Aramaic Catechesis; (b) from Matthew's preaching to the Jews of Palestine came his Aramaic Gospel; (c) Mark then resulted from St. Peter's preaching and the Aramaic Matthew; (d) next came Matthew's Greek Gospel substantially identical with its Aramaic original, but also dependent on Mark; (e) then came Luke, dependent on Mark, St. Paul's preaching, the Blessed Virgin, eye-witnesses, special sources, and perhaps a collection of Christ's sayings as derived from the Greek Matthew.

Msgr. Barton has not only carefully edited the volume before us, but has also made some valuable contributions to its contents. Thus, he has given in the beginning a brief survey of the Synoptic Problem; at the end of chapter I he has added a discussion of the relation of Peter's preaching to Mark's Gospel; he has compiled a supplement to chapter 16 on some further indications of an Aramaic original for Matthew; he has introduced a number of notes on the text of the various chapters; and finally, at the end of the volume, he has succinctly summarized the whole work. The book is a distinct contribution to New Testament studies, but will naturally be of interest only to specialists.

CHARLES J. CALLAN, O. P.

The Church always shows herself solicitous that the "celestial treasure of the sacred books, so bountifully bestowed on man by the Holy Spirit, should not lie neglected" (Council of Trent). She has prescribed that a considerable portion of them shall be read and piously reflected upon by all her ministers in the daily office of the sacred psalmody. She has ordered that in cathedral churches, in monasteries, and in other convents in which study can easily be pursued, they shall be expounded and interpreted by capable men; and she strictly commanded that her children shall be fed with the saving words of the Gospel at least on Sundays and solemn feasts. Moreover, it is owing to the wisdom and exertion of the Church that there has always been continued, from century to century, that cultivation of Holy Scripture which has been so remarkable and has borne such ample fruit.

Leo XIII, *Providentissimus Deus*

OUR LORD AND THE PHARISEES

How came it that Israel did not believe in Jesus? His teaching was a sublime complement of that of the Prophets; and He attested its truth by great miracles. How is it, then, that His own people resisted the evidence that His mission was from God and failed to submit their minds to what He taught? A part of the answer to this question may be given when we know the Pharisees of the first century as they are revealed in such contemporary writings as the Gospels, the Epistles of St. Paul, the history of Josephus, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (about the time of Christ), the Psalms of Solomon, the Apocalypse of Esdras and in the later, essentially Pharisaic Talmud.

CHARACTER OF THE SOCIETY OF THE PHARISEES

The Pharisees formed a distinct, well-defined society in Our Lord's time. They called themselves *Habhurim*, i. e., companions or friends or brothers. Their proselytizing is referred to by Our Lord (Mt. 23:15). Women were admitted into their ranks. Those initiated into their companies vowed respect for vows, faithfulness to Levitical ceremonial purity, regard for the property of others, the payment of tithes, and the avoidance of "the people of the land." They regarded these "people of the land," many of whom lived in Galilee, as in a state of perpetual legal defilement because of their ignoring the laws of ritual cleanliness. The vegetable food which was obtained from them was regarded as not pure, since it was assumed that they had not paid the tithes on it. The number of the Pharisees cannot be ascertained with precision; but they must not be regarded as a very great part of the Jewish people. In the time of Herod the Great their number was about 6000, according to Josephus.¹

The name Pharisee, given them by outsiders, means "separated." The Pharisees stood for the maintenance of complete separation of the Jews from the rest of the world, by an intense adhesion to the Jewish religion, laws, and customs. Only the most zealous defenders of the traditions of the Fathers were admitted into their society. Most of the Scribes, or, as St. Luke calls them, the Doctors of the Law (Rabbis), belonged to them. They gave to the society all the prestige which could be reflected on it by the only science of the time, that of the Sacred Scrip-

¹ *Antiquities of the Jews*, XVII, ii.

tures. They had, in general, a right understanding of the Bible; and Our Lord could tell His disciples to do as they taught, though He warned them against doing as they did (Mt. 23:1-3). They were much more faithful to the doctrines revealed to Israel than were the Sadducees. There was, then, real zeal for religion and for their country in the separation of the Pharisees; and in the past they had rendered real service in preserving the religion and the customs of the nation from the pagan influences which were pressing in upon it. They were the successors of the *Hassidim* of Maccabean times. For this reason among others they were much more popular than the Sadducees, who formed the dominant party during Our Lord's life. The people accepted them as the real interpreters of Scripture rather than the Sadducees, the Herodians, the Essenes, or the later Zelots.

PHARISEES LACKED CHARITY AND HUMILITY

Their aloofness from all that was not Jewish developed into a hatred of other peoples; their zeal for ceremonial cleanness begot contempt for "the multitude that knoweth not the law" (Jn. 7:49). They regarded the "people of the land" as impure; for those who committed worse sins their disdainful aloofness was complete. In their zealous attachment to external practices imposed by scribal tradition they neglected the very root-principles of the divine law—love, mercy. In their good works, moreover—their fasting, their almsgiving and their prayers—they were deficient in purity of intention. Their austerity gave them a reputation for piety, as their learning gave them a reputation for wisdom, and they bent their best efforts to the maintenance of this reputation. They sought the glory of men rather than the glory of God. They were not only uncharitable but proud.

It is against Pharisaic pride that St. Paul contends in Romans. While recognizing that the Jewish people, dominated in theological matters by the Pharisees, have a "zeal of God," he tells us that it is not according to knowledge; that not knowing man's helplessness and dependence on God for the acquisition of sanctifying grace, they seek to obtain "their own justice," by legal observances rather than by "faith." While the Pharisees prayed they counted chiefly on themselves.

OUR LORD'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE PHARISEES

Now the Prophet from Nazareth was not of the sect of the Pharisees—this was His first crime; then He had not the least respect either for their learning or their sanctity. He showed

that He would not observe all the Pharisaic traditions; and the kind of conduct which He recommended was based entirely on the love of God and man. He insisted on the inner dispositions of the heart and on acting with a view to pleasing not men but the Heavenly Father. He was charitable and humble of heart; He had more esteem for the lowly Publican than for the proud Pharisee. (cf. Luke 18:9-14.) He called the Pharisees, as a class, hypocrites.

During the second part of His ministry, the opposition of the Pharisees which must have arisen as soon as He began to teach and to draw the multitudes after Himself and away from them, becomes more and more pronounced and outspoken. St. Mark groups together a series of five incidents which graphically portray their growing hostility (Mk. 2:1—3:6). These incidents are also related in the parallel passages of St. Matthew and St. Luke.

The first is that in which Jesus says to the man sick with the palsy, "Son, thy sins are forgiven thee." There were Scribes there, some of them from Jerusalem according to St. Luke. They reasoned within their hearts: "Why does this man speak thus? He is blaspheming: who can forgive sins but one, namely God?" Those Scribes who actually witnessed the cure by which Jesus showed that the Son of Man on earth hath power to forgive sins, must have recognized that they had never seen the like, that they had seen wonderful things that day. It is not likely, however, that even these eye-witnesses of the miracle were convinced.

The Pharisees and Scribes are next introduced as extremely shocked when Our Lord called Matthew the Publican to follow Him, and become an intimate disciple; and likewise when they saw Him sit down to a meal in Matthew's house at Capharnaum with the toll-gatherer's friends (Mk. 2:13-17). They said to His disciples: "He eats with publicans and sinners." Jesus hearing it said to them: "They that are well need not a Physician, but they that are ill. I came not to call the just, but sinners to penance."

They questioned His conduct when they saw Him eating on one of their traditional fast days; and He made it clear to them that He and His disciples had no intention of taking up their traditions in this respect, thus sewing undressed cloth on an old garment, or pouring the new wine of the Gospel into old wine-skins (Mk. 2:18-22).

But what they resented most keenly was the violation of the Sabbath: the Law said one should not thresh grain on the Lord's day. The Scribes claimed that rubbing together in one's hands a few ears of grain to eat when one was hungry was threshing; and they complained to Our Lord because His disciples were guilty of this offense. Jesus argued with them to show that a positive law is susceptible of exceptions and that, besides, their interpretation of the law was not justified. He declared that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath, and that He Himself as Son of Man was Master even of the Sabbath (Mk. 2:23-28). The strangest of all their conceptions regarding the Sabbath comes out when they claimed that Jesus violated the law by healing on that day; and it is after they see Him cure a withered hand at a synagogue meeting that they go out and enter into league with the Herodians (the partisans of the Herodian family) and consulted with them how they might destroy Him (Mk. 3:1-6).

CHARGE OF DIABOLISM

To turn the people from the new Teacher, Scribes from Jerusalem reinforce those of Galilee. St. Luke, as we have said, represents them as present at the cure of the paralytic. St. Mark attributes to these strangers the first solution proposed by unbelief to account for the supernatural power of Jesus: "He hath Beelzebub, and in the prince of the devils He casteth out devils (Mk. 3:22)." After arguing with mildness against this charge Our Lord declared that they had committed the irremissible sin. It consisted according to Mk. 3:30, in attributing to the devil the manifestation of divine goodness and grace which the Holy Spirit had made in the words and deeds of the Savior.² It was now perfectly clear that the word of Jesus could not more take root in the proud heart of the Pharisees, as a class, than can the seed which falls from the sower's hand take root in the hard roads that run through grain-fields of Galilee.

OUR LORD DENOUNCES PHARISAIC TRADITIONS

In 7:1-23 of St. Mark, just before Our Lord finally withdraws from the ministry of preaching in His native province, we find

² "They attack that which can save them, place themselves in direct contradiction with grace and goodness; this is what Saint Thomas indicates: *Dicitur irremissibile (peccatum) secundum suam naturam, in quantum excludit ea per quae fit remissio.*" Lagrange, ad I.

Him explicitly repudiating the traditions of the Pharisees as commandments of men, of a nature, in some cases, to withdraw people from the service of God.³

While He rejected only the traditions of the Pharisees and not the Law of Moses, He enunciated on this occasion principles about foods which, so St. Mark later realized, meant that distinctions between "clean" and "unclean" were to be abrogated in the new dispensation. The last words of verse 19 (*καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα*) mean that He declared all food clean. The break with the Pharisees was now complete; but they had not yet found out how they could destroy Him.

ATTITUDE OF PHARISEES DURING PASSION WEEK

At Jerusalem during Passion week, the Pharisees are still united with the Herodians and, as frequently in the past, they seek to catch Jesus in His words, that is to get Him to commit Himself to some statement which could serve as the basis of a legal charge (12:13-17). They were less prominent, however, in the last scenes of Our Lord's life than the Sadduces, who were more powerful at the capital and particularly in the Sanhedrin. These worldly politicians, under the fear of losing the power which Rome still left to the Jews, were ready for measures from which the Pharisees, with all their jealousy for their authority and traditions, would probably have recoiled if left to themselves.

WENDELL S. REILLY, S. S.

³ 7:11-12 mean: "You say that if a man tells his father or mother that the money which might have been at your service is Corban (that is, dedicated to God) he is not bound to do anything for his father or mother."

OBSCURITIES IN THE LATIN PSALTER

I. INTRODUCTORY SKETCH

The editors of the *Quarterly* hope to present a series of papers under the general title above. The single papers appearing in each issue will aim at simplicity and brevity, but their object and method should be fully explained in advance.

The aim in view is not a complete exegesis of the Psalmist's literal sense. This would, of course, demand critical scrutiny of the original text of every passage; discussion of the historical factors of period, author, and occasion; detailed study of the original language, and so on. This would often be superfluous to the mere removal of obscurity in the Latin of the Psalter. One need, not, for instance, discuss the interpretation of *Ego dixi, dii estis* (Ps. 81:6), so long as this makes good verbal sense as it stands. Nor should one labor to establish the original text of passages like *Apprehendite disciplinam* (2:12) or *Foderunt manus meas et pedes meos* (21:17), which, if open to some question of textual authority, are clear enough in the Latin.

Our material is the text of the Vulgate and the Breviary. Our aim is simply to clarify its expressions where they appear obscure to average attention—to make grammatically and logically intelligible the words in which we are bidden to pray.

Since a merely plausible explanation might be more ingenious than well founded, the effort will always be made to avoid mere patchwork and to judge by basic facts. It is therefore clear that the subsoil of original text and language must often be probed for the roots of a sound explanation. It will not, however, engage primary and direct attention, as in the investigations of scientific exegesis.

The difference of attitude is due to the aim of this series of papers. The Psalter is the Christian Priest's inspired manual of praise and prayer. *Domine, in unione illius divinae intentionis, qua Ipse in terris laudes Deo persolvisti, has Tibi horas persolvo.* The wording of these prayers for us is that of the Vulgate, the Church's authorized version of Holy Scripture, and therefore of the Psalms. But what does their wording mean to us, what does it express for us, as we use it in prayer? Obvious-

ly, not always what the Psalmist's words meant to himself and expressed for him.

The Abbé Vigouroux is a trustworthy spokesman.¹ In a paragraph on "the study of the Literal Sense of the Psalms" he gives us the benefit of his thorough biblical scholarship. In a following one on "the study of the Spiritual Sense of the Psalms" he has this among other things to say:

The voice of the Psalmist is not only the voice of David; it is also that of the Church and of humanity. "Psalmus vox Ecclesiae est," says St. Ambrose. Thus it is easy to apply the Psalms to our Lord, to His Kingdom, and to ourselves; and in the liturgical Office it becomes our duty to do so, since the Church, in obliging us to chant or recite them, certainly did not intend us to make on the spur of the moment a course in exegesis or biblical history, but intended that we should pray, and should consequently elicit interior affections, placing our hearts in harmony with that of David, and so appropriating to ourselves the sentiments of the Psalmist. It is by reading books composed with this end in view, and still more by meditation, that we are enabled to discover the figurative or moral sense of the Psalms, and to apply them to our own necessities. The principal and ordinary aim of teaching is the study of the literal sense; that of the spiritual sense is specially reserved to personal reflection.

These words well distinguish the function of the teacher of exegesis from that of the custodian of praise and prayer. The latter, however, is still a rational agent, to whom spiritual aspiration must be something intelligible. It is but Christian for him to avow, with St. Paul (1 Cor. 14:15), "I will pray with the spirit, I will pray also with the understanding." And when the understanding is baffled by cryptic words of prayer, the spirit can but take a step in the dark, with an act of obedience as its only attainment. A ray of sunlight on the darker area might serve to enliven it with richer fruit.

Something has been said of ulterior sources as containing roots of explanation. One of these sources in particular deserves some fuller account, even at the risk of recalling what is already well enough known.

St. Jerome's Latin version of the Hebrew Psalms does not meet us in the Vulgate and the Breviary. They incorporate his "Gallican" recension. The source which he thus revised was the Old Latin Psalter, which was the Septuagint in very literal Latin.

¹ *Manuel Biblique*, 13th edition, 1914, Vol. 2 (not one of those disapproved in this edition), pp. 358 ff.

Hence, while his critical apparatus for this purpose included the whole material of Origen's Hexapla, the Septuagint (though somewhat rectified from this source) was bound to predominate. This was wholly appropriate to a new Latin version destined to official and public use. The Septuagint through its Old Latin version had gained a hold on Christian use which could not be violently detached without alarming confusion. Moreover, the Septuagint had at least the claim of a higher antiquity to textual superiority itself. A thorough recension of its Latin form was on all accounts entitled to become the Psalter of the Vulgate.

But Jerome had a further word on the Psalter for the comparative study of more learned circles. Five years later he produced the direct translation of the Hebrew which appears among his writings.² The Hebrew text before him then (391), though written without vowel-signs, appears close enough in consonantal structure to our modern Massoretic text to establish substantial identity between the two. Hence the value to us of Jerome's Psalter from the Hebrew alone. It shows us how he would latinize the Hebrew of our own day if he considered its claims exclusive, or at least predominant. Whether or not they should be so considered is still left to the judgment of the textual critic, as it was then. Jerome's version from the Hebrew has no more authentic sovereignty on its own intrinsic merits than the version he had earlier prepared for the Vulgate. But the former is of more assistance to us than any other single source in disentangling many of our version's puzzles, and we shall rely much upon its aid.

To return to the task before us in these papers, it is not an easy matter to compile a list of obscure passages to the satisfaction of all. Some of our readers will deem some comments superfluous and others defective. Possibly the first precaution should be not to multiply obscurities. To begin with an obvious exclusion, no attention need be given to the explanation of evident metaphors or tropes, such as *Sacerdotes ejus induam salutari* (131:6). Nor need whole contexts be unified by suggesting changes in the tense of verbs or in the person and number of possessive pronouns, so easy to confuse in the Hebrew itself by the mere change of a final letter.

But when it comes to real obscurities, at least three types can be discerned:

² Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, 28, 1189-1306.

- (a) A few expressions which seem to make no sense at all.
- (b) Clauses or phrases clear enough in themselves, but with a meaning detached from that of their context.
- (c) Single words apparently meaningless in their setting (often Hebrew idioms too literally reproduced to express the western mind).

For such obscurities as these some explanation will be attempted in the following issues. The Psalms will be treated in order, and the numbering of Psalm and verse will always be that of the Vulgate text, even where a mere title, which does not appear in the Breviary, may serve as Verse 1 in the Vulgate and so disturb comparison.

At times more than one solution may be offered, as good authorities may chance to differ. This will not often be necessary. But, in view of its prospect, the abbreviations to be used for economy of space may once for all be indicated now:

Bi. = T. E. Bird, D. D., Commentary on the Psalms, 2 vols., 1927.

Bo. = Patrick Boylan, M. A., The Psalms, 2 vols., 1920.

Fi. = L. C. Fillion, S. S., The New Psalter of the Roman Breviary, 1915.

Ho. = G. Hoberg, Die Psalmen der Vulgata, 1892.

Ni. = J. Niglutsch, Brevis Explicatio Psalmorum, 5th edition, 1923.

Zo. = F. Zorell, S. J., Psalterium ex Hebraeo Latinum, 1928.

For the present we wish to add a few exegetical notes that may be of practical interest to our readers.

HOMILETICAL NOTES ON THE MAGI: GOSPEL FOR THE FEAST OF THE EPIPHANY

Mt. 2:1—*Wise men*. An individual *magus* (Acts 8:9; 13:6,8) might be a fraudulent diviner or sorcerer. But here, with several *magi* associated, and relying on a star, we have professional astrologers, a more honorable class in general.

From the east not only specifies their origin but also confirms this view of their calling. Individual astrologers were everywhere; but it was in "the east"—Chaldea (now Iraq), Media, and Persia—that astrologers existed as a numerous and official caste. Our Magi may have come from anywhere east of the Euphrates; most probably they were Persians. Their religion was that of Zoroaster or Zarathustra. Judging from their profession, they were probably priests of that cult. Versed in the astronomy of their time, they applied it to astrological divination. In spite of the

measure of superstition attaching to this practice, and of a dualistic theory of the universe, their religion stood high among pagan systems. Their professional life was virtuous, and the personal qualities displayed by these particular Magi in their disheartening search for the infant Christ show them worthy representatives of the Gentile world in paying him its earliest homage. We think of them as three in number, perhaps from the number of their offerings. They can hardly have been kings or princes in rank. That their personal names were Gaspar, Melchior, and Balthasar has no historical basis, but their veneration as saints is not discredited by the use of these names.

To Jerusalem. If they came from Persia, the journey (probably by camel) would take several months; even from Chaldea, a month or two. Their shortest way would lead across the Syrian Desert and through Damascus. To men of their occupation, although of frugal habits, this involved both prolonged hardships and personal risk.

2:2—*He that is born King of the Jews.* Even had Judea been independent, they had no motive for coming to acknowledge a political successor of David. Their language denoted the expected Christ, as Herod and the Jewish people at once understood.

We have seen his star. That the world's Deliverer, now expected by many peoples, must be sought among the Jews, the Magi may have come to believe through the influence which Jewish thought had exerted in their part of the world ever since the Babylonian Exile. That what they had observed was *his star*, signifying his arrival, may have been revealed to them. Certainly, their unique vocation came through the medium of an object familiar to their daily tasks, as supernatural vocations so often do. That the star was accompanied by a personal revelation relating it to Christ's coming, seems further probable from its mysterious nature. This has been much discussed. The widespread explanation that it was a transient conjunction of two known planets, instead of pointing to some definite occurrence in history, has only created further difference of opinion, increased by a misunderstanding of Kepler, whose explanation was really different (with *Cath. Ency.* II, 31-c, compare *America*, Dec. 28, 1935, p. 270). In fact, the later movements of the same "star" could only be those of a miraculous apparition, since the Magi themselves, though they thought it a star, noticed (verse 9) that its course was leading them to a house in Bethlehem.

In the east may also be translated *at its rising*, but the same phrase in verse 9 seems to contrast places rather than times.

2:3—*Troubled* in consequence of their own debased conception of the authority of the promised Christ. Herod, immoral and irreligious, could be superstitious enough to suspect a rival claimant to his throne, especially if expected by Magi. The people preferred security under Roman misrule to the prospect of revolution. The just claim of the Church to supreme

dominion in the realm of human consciences excites the same jealous suspicion in all ages.

2:4—*Where Christ should be born.* If prophecy had foretold the place, Herod could use the Magi for his own evil purposes. Hence he would see them *privately*.

2:8—*Sending them into Bethlehem.* Their first definite direction to the right place came from the worst enemy of what they sought and loved. God may guide us in His truth and grace by means of persons who are not to be followed in everything.

2:9—*Went before them until, etc.* Bethlehem is reached by a left-hand fork from the road southward to Hebron. At such a point they could have seen unmistakably that the star itself was showing their way.

2:10—*Seeing the star, they rejoiced* as soon as they recognized it. This implies that they had not seen it for some time past, perhaps during the whole of their journey. Whatever kept it from their sight, its disappearance must have severely tested their faith. When, in addition, they found that no one in Jerusalem had even heard of one "born King of the Jews," we marvel at their perseverance in a quest that seemed so hopeless. Now it leads from Jerusalem to the obscurity of Bethlehem, yet they still keep on. These first Gentile subjects of Christ the King were men of genuine faith.

2:11—*Into the house.* This regular Greek word for a building hardly fits the stable cavern where the manger was (Lk. 2:7). Better lodging could be found a few days after Jesus' birth, and more than six weeks had probably now elapsed (Lk. 2:22).

Falling down they adored him. The Magi may or may not have expected an incarnation of the Deity. Matthew's language does not imply divine worship. Traced through the Greek version of the Old Testament, it is the standard translation of a Hebrew expression meaning no more than "prostration and reverence" offered to a human superior (Ruth 2,10; 1 Kgs. 20:41; 25:23; and often elsewhere). Certainly the Magi solemnly acknowledged the Child Jesus as the promised vicegerent of God upon earth, whether or not they worshiped him as God in person.

Gold, frankincense, and myrrh, the most costly products of their country, seemed to them the fittest offerings to a king. The symbolic meanings (royalty, divinity, sacrificial death) so often ascribed to the three gifts, might be typified by them in the purpose of God without having been present to the minds of the Magi.

2:12—*An answer,* not necessarily to an explicit prayer for guidance, although they may have begun to suspect Herod's intentions.

Another way, perhaps southward and then to the east of the Dead Sea. Even to return through Jericho would have been dangerous, and the western route up the Mediterranean coast would be very public.

WILLIAM H. MCCLELLAN, S. J.

THE HARTFORD MEETING

THE REPORT OF THE RECORDING SECRETARY ON THE GENERAL MEETING OF THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

A general meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America was held at Hartford on October 1 and 2, 1938, under the patronage of His Excellency, the Most Reverend Maurice F. McAuliffe, D. D., Bishop of Hartford, and in conjunction with the Fourth National Catechetical Congress of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

Various sessions of the meeting were honored by the presence of Their Excellencies, the Most Reverend Edwin V. O'Hara, Bishop of Great Falls, and chairman of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine; the Most Reverend George L. Leech, D. D., J. C. D., Bishop of Harrisburg; and the Most Reverend Francis P. Carroll, D. D., Bishop of Calgary, Canada. Both Bishop O'Hara and Bishop Leech addressed kind words of encouragement and commendation to the Association, stressing the importance of biblical studies and of the splendid work in which the Association is engaged.

Previous to the first session on Saturday morning a Mass was celebrated for deceased members in St. Patrick's Church, Hartford. The celebrant was the Most Reverend Edwin V. O'Hara, and he was assisted by the Reverends Donat Poulet, O. M. I., and Edward H. Donze, S. M.

The deceased members of the Catholic Biblical Association:

Patrick Cardinal Hayes, Patron of the Association, died at New York, September 4, 1938.

Gregory G. Rybrook, Ord. Praem., died at West De Pere, Wis. on June 6, 1937, aged 62.

Romain Butin, S. M., died at Washington, D. C. on Dec. 8, 1937, aged 67.

Joseph H. Schumacher, died at Little Rock, Ark. on June 15, 1938, aged 32.

Francis A. Walsh, O. S. B., died at Washington, D. C. on Aug. 12, 1938, aged 54.

This year the Association was pleased to note among those attending the sessions several scriptural scholars from Canada. The members present at the meeting included the following:

Arbez, Edward, S. S.	Cerny, Edward, S. S.	Costello, Chas., O. M. I.
Washington, D. C.	Baltimore, Md.	Washington, D. C.
Byrne, Edward,	Coleran, James, S. J.	Cotter, Anthony, S. J.
Rochester, N. Y.	Weston, Mass.	Weston, Mass.
Callan, Charles, O. P.	Collins, John, S. J.	DeVine, C. R., C. SS. R.
Hawthorne, N. Y.	Weston, Mass.	Woodstock, Ontario.

Donzé, Edward, S. M.	McClellan, W. H., S. J.	Poulet, Donat, O. M. I.
Washington, D. C.	Woodstock, Md.	Ottawa, Canada.
Dougherty, John J.	McGlinchey, J., C. M.	Reilly, W. S., S. S.
Darlington, N. J.	Philadelphia, Pa.	Baltimore, Md.
Garant, C. O.	McGlynn, H., C. S. Sp.	Rowan, John
Quebec, Canada.	Ferndale, Conn.	Philadelphia, Pa.
Gaul, Cyril, O. S. B.	McHugh, J. A., O. P.	Skehan, Patrick W.
St. Meinrad, Ind.	Hawthorne, N. Y.	Washington, D. C.
Gruenthaner, M., S. J.	Mangan, E., C. SS. R.	Smith, K., O. M. Cap.
St. Marys, Kans.	Oconomowoc, Wis.	Marathon, Wis.
Hanley, John,	Murray, John J.,	Stapleton, Matthew
Trenton, Ontario.	Jamaica Plain, Mass.	Brighton, Mass.
Heupler, C., O. M. Cap.	Newton, William	Steinmueller, J. E.
Washington, D. C.	Washington, D. C.	Huntington, N. Y.
Kennedy, M., O. F. M.	Pelletier, George L.	Sullivan, Thomas C.
Washington, D. C.	Quebec, Canada.	Union City, N. J.
LeBuffe, F. P., S. J.	Pickar, C. H., O. S. A.	Temple, Patrick J.
New York, N. Y.	Washington, D. C.	New York City.
LeHoullier, A., O. M. I.	Plassmann, T., O. F. M.	Yungfleisch, S., C. P.
So. Natick, Mass.	St. Bonaventure, N. Y.	Baltimore, Md.

The papers read on Saturday at the sessions held in the Moorish Room of the Bond Hotel were as follows:

10:00 A. M.

"The Eschatological Discourse," Rev. Anthony C. Cotter, S. J.,
Weston, Mass.

"The Essence of the Mass and Scripture," Very Rev. John A.
McHugh, O. P., S. T. M., Litt. D., Hawthorne, N. Y.

"One Crowd of Women Went to Grace," Rev. Edward A. Mangan,
C. SS. R., S. S. L., Oconomowoc, Wisconsin.

2:00 P. M.

"The Consequent Sense," Rev. Charles R. DeVine, C. SS. R.,
S. S. L., Woodstock, Ontario.

"The Seventy Weeks of Daniel," Rev. Michael J. Gruenthaner,
S. J., S. T. D., S. S. D., St. Mary's, Kansas.

"The Relation of the Scripture Professor to Discussion Clubs,"
Discussion Leader, Rev. John F. Rowan, S. T. D., S. S. L.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

At four-thirty o'clock on Saturday the Reverend Gregory Smith, chairman of the Discussion Clubs at the National Center of the Confraternity, gave an interesting demonstration of the methods employed in conducting a Discussion Club. He used as the text one of the pamphlets published by the Confraternity on the Life of Christ, and distributed copies among the members present. Father Smith stated that many biblical brochures yet remain to be written for the use of the Clubs.

As a social feature of their meeting the members met for dinner, which was served in the Moorish Room, at which the guest of honor was the Most Reverend George L. Leech, D. D., J. C. D., Bishop of Harrisburg.

The business meeting of the Association was held at eight o'clock on Saturday evening. The report of the treasurer showed that there was a cash balance of \$1,857.96 on hand. Father Steinmueller, who had been delegated to investigate the question of the incorporation of the Association, reported that while we could be included in the episcopal charter of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, it was deemed advisable to have a separate charter, and that this should be applied for either in Maryland or in the District of Columbia. Father Steinmueller was instructed to make further inquiries.

The next question was the publication of a Biblical Quarterly, the first issue to appear in January, 1939. After some discussion, during which Fathers Callan, Gaul, Stapleton, Steinmueller, Donze, Rowan, Mangan, Newton, McClellan, Pickar, Plassmann, and Reilly expressed their opinions, the opportuneness of publishing the Quarterly was put to a vote. It was decided in favor of the project by a vote of twenty-six to five. The motion was then made that regarding the character of the Quarterly the program adopted by the Executive Board be accepted with modifications. This motion was carried unanimously.

Then followed reports of the various Committees. Father Donze, the chairman of the Committee on Membership, gave the qualifications necessary for active members, and for associate members, all of which had been decided at the April meeting of the executive board in Washington. Life members are already determined in the Constitution.

Father Newton presented a report of the Commission to England. He stated that those whom he had approached in England were quite enthusiastic about the Association, and signified their intention of becoming members. Some suggested affiliated organizations in England and Ireland. It was decided, however, to await the further development of the Association.

Father Steinmueller, the chairman of the Committee on the Enlargement of Resources, proposed the question whether those who had paid their dues for the current year should receive the Quarterly without a further assessment. The motion was proposed and carried that active members pay their regular dues of five dollars for 1939.

The final business of the evening was the report of the Committee on Nominations. The following were proposed and unanimously elected: President, the Very Rev. John A. McHugh, O. P., professor of theology at Maryknoll Seminary, Maryknoll, N. Y.; vice president, the Rev. Donat Poulet, O. M. I., of the University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Can.; general secretary, the Rev. Edward Donze, S. M., of Washing-

ton, D. C.; recording secretary, the Rev. Mark Kennedy, O. F. M., of Washington, D. C.; treasurer, the Rev. John Steinmueller, Huntington, N. Y.; editor of publications, the Rev. Cyril Gaul, O. S. B., of St. Meinrad Seminary, Indiana; editorial board for the Quarterly, the Rev. Wendell S. Reilly, S. S., St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md.; the Rev. Wm. H. McClellan, S. J., Woodstock, Md.; the Rev. Edward H. Donze, S. M., Washington, D. C.; the Rev. Chas. H. Pickar, O. S. A., Washington; the Rev. John F. Rowan, St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa.

On Sunday morning there was a meeting of the Editorial Board for the revision of the New Testament, and of the revisors who were present in Hartford. Bishop O'Hara presided. Father Newton told of the gracious reception he was accorded by biblical men in Rome, who read our Constitution and gave it their full approval. In asking for advice on our project of revising the Old Testament he was given every encouragement, cooperation, and assistance by Roman ecclesiastics prominent in the biblical field.

At ten-thirty o'clock a Solemn Pontifical Mass was celebrated in St. Joseph's Cathedral by the Bishop of Hartford, at which the Most Reverend John Gregory Murray, D. D., Archbishop of St. Paul, preached the sermon. The members of the Biblical Association were among those present at the Mass.

The final session of the meeting of the Association was held on Sunday afternoon. After the scheduled papers had been read by Father Wm. McClellan on "The Newly Proposed Translation of Genesis, 2:5-6," and by Father Edward Byrne on "The Study of Scripture in the Seminary," the retiring president, Father Newton, disposed of some business items which remained from the previous evening. As secretary of the Editorial Board, he gave a report on the work of the revision of the English New Testament. Father Newton stated that he was happy to announce that the revision was practically completed, and should be published within approximately a year. There was then a report and a discussion of the tentative principles for the revision of the Old Testament. Father Newton conveyed to the members of the Association the congratulatory words that had been expressed in Rome, where he visited last summer, on the work accomplished by the Association, notably the revision of the New Testament; and the hope that the revision of the Old Testament would soon be undertaken. Suggestions made in Rome regarding the principles to be adopted for the revision of the Old Testament, which will facilitate the work, were discussed at length.

It was suggested that, for the information of the new members of the Association, the Secretary list in his report the Editorial Board on the Revision of the Douay New Testament. This same group is also making preparations for the revision of the Old Testament.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Rev. Edward Arbez, S.S., M.A., S.T.D.

Chief Editor, Text

Very Rev. Thomas Plassmann, O.F.M., Ph.D., S.T.D., Litt.D.

General Consultant

Rev. Charles Callan, O.P., S.T.M., Litt.D.

English

Reverend John McHugh, O.P., S.T.M., Litt.D.

Indices

Rev. Edward Donze, S.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.

Headings, Captions, etc.

Rev. John Steinmueller, S.T.D., S.S.L.

Introductions

Rev. Wendell Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D.

Notes and Commentary

Rev. Charles Pickar, O.S.A., S.T.L., S.S.L.

Archivist

Rev. William Newton, M.A., S.S.D.

General Secretary

Father Newton concluded the proceedings of the afternoon with a scholarly and masterful address, which he delivered as the retiring head of the organization. He took as his theme: "Nil actum si quid agendum," words which the Holy Father had used as the basis for a talk to scriptural scholars. In his address, which will be found elsewhere in the Quarterly, Father Newton urged the members of the Association to continue their enthusiastic support of biblical researches and studies which in a vast degree still remain to be done in the United States.

The meeting adjourned with everyone present expressing full satisfaction at the happy and scientific manner in which it had been conducted. Resolutions of gratitude had been passed for the painstaking efforts of those in charge of the meeting, and of those who so unselfishly have directed the destinies of our infant Association.

That this account of the proceedings of the Third General Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association will be an incentive for the members who were unable to be present this year to make the effort to be with us at the coming general session in Cincinnati is the fervent wish of the retiring recording secretary.

REVEREND JOHN F. ROWAN.

BIBLICAL NEWS

REVISION OF THE DOUAY NEW TESTAMENT

During the past year, the Catholic and secular Press have noticed with a great deal of enthusiasm, the progress of the Catholic Biblical Association and its work on the revision of the New Testament in English. This work of the Association has attracted the attention of scholars not only in America, but also in Europe. The *Osservatore Romano* for June 3, 1938 (La Traduzione inglese della Bibbia e la diffusione degli studi catechistici) outlined the purpose of the Association and the principles upon which the Revision of the New Testament in English are based. In recent months, interest in the work was increased by the appearance in print of the new revision of St. John's Gospel, and a commentary on the same, by the Rev. William L. Newton, M.A., S.S.D., of the Catholic University of America. The *New York Times*, The *Boston Sunday Post*, The *Denver Register*, The *Catholic Review*, together with several other Catholic newspapers and periodicals, have commented very favorably on the work.

However, the work is by no means complete. It is true that the revised text of the New Testament is complete in manuscript form. But the task of reviewing the work of the revisors is a serious one, and naturally consumes a great deal of time. With the exception also of the work of three revisors, the commentary is complete. But the Editors have reviewed practically a third of the manuscripts presented. All things being considered, the work of the revision has steadily progressed since its inception on January 18, 1936; and it is hoped that the entire work will be finished and in the hands of the printer within the next eighteen months.

In the meantime, the Association has made plans for the Revision of the Old Testament. During the past year, the basic principles, to regulate this work, were discussed and outlined. All recognize and admit the fact that the Old Testament presents problems quite different from those of the New Testament. Naturally such questions must be regulated by a set of uniform principles. However, the principles in general, which regulated the Revision of the New Testament, are incorporated in those for the Revision of the Old Testament. At present a tentative list of Revisors has been selected; and within a short time, pending the final acceptances of the individuals, as well as their approval by the Episcopal Committee, the work of the Revision of the Old Testament will be under way. No time limit has been set for the completion of this work. In all probability it will cover a period of some years. The present plan is to publish the revised books in possibly three or four parts. This plan, with a more numerous Editorial Board, will perhaps facilitate the work and hasten its completion.

Each issue of the *Quarterly* will carry a statement on the work and progress of the Revision.

CHARLES H. PICKAR, O.S.A.

CAMBRIDGE SUMMER SCHOOL OF CATHOLIC STUDIES
CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND

For the past 16 or 17 years the English Conference for Higher Studies has been organizing an annual series of lectures on academic subjects of Catholic interest. These have been held at the mediæval university city of Cambridge, usually during the first week of August. This year the subject chosen was the Old Testament. Fifteen lectures by outstanding Catholic authorities were given, and in addition some 10 classes were conducted by the lecturers in which special problems connected with the subject were treated, and questions invited from those attending the school.

The series was intended as an introduction to the whole of the Old Testament and an incentive to a deeper and more intensive study of the Bible. The audience had the privilege of listening to a number of very distinguished and learned lecturers: His Excellency, Archbishop Goodier, S. J., author of several books on biblical subjects; Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S. J., professor and editor of the Westminster Version of the Scriptures; Msgr. J. M. A. Barton, professor and consultor on the Biblical Commission; V. Rev. Hugh Pope, O. P., author of *Student Aids to the Bible*; Canon Boylan, author of the well known commentary of the Psalms; Rev. John Arendzen, advisor for the Catholic Evidence Guild; Rev. R. Dyson, S. J., professor at the Biblical Institute, Rome. The lecturers included also several scholarly professors from the various theological establishments in England: Rev. R. Foster, of St. Mary's, Oscott, Rev. A. Bonnar, O. F. M., of the Friary, Forest Gate, Rev. A. Jones, of St. Joseph's, Upholland, Rev. D. Allen, O. S. B., of St. Lawrence's Abbey, Ampleforth, Rev. E. Grady, of St. John's, Womersley, and the Rev. J. Garvin. Father Dyson also provided an illustrated lecture on the Nile Valley. A social programme was arranged to relieve the stress of such an active schedule.

Archbishop Goodier spoke fascinatingly of the unique position of the Bible, considered as literature. It has no parallel in the literature of any other people. All other literature deals with man and the products of his mind. The Scriptures begin with God and are centered on Him. Other classics are known by individual names: Confucius, Buddha, Vergil, Homer. The Bible represents a whole people speaking, it lays bare to our eyes the soul of a nation. It lacks the consciousness of literary effort so evident in most other classics, it is natural, spontaneous. All other nations produced literatures, but the literature of the Hebrews built them.

The paper on the Ras Shamra Tablets and the Old Testament, read by Fr. Lattey, was originally assigned to Rev. Eric Burrows, S. J., famous among the orientlists of England, who met with a fatal accident some few months before. Fr. Lattey stressed the new light and evidence supplied by these tablets in support of Holy Writ, and pointed out that they spell the end of some theories of the Wellhausen school.

Fr. Hugh Pope treated the question of the Canon summarily but most lucidly. He praised especially St. Jerome's work on the Vulgate, describing his method of using the aid of an interpreter while dictating to a secretary. He also spoke of the quality of the translation into English made at Douai, illustrating its adherence to the Latin. He contended that Challoner left hardly a verse of the Douai untouched, and though the result made for better English, it did not always produce a better sense. He also referred to the work of revision now in progress in the United States, expressing his eagerness "to see what will come of it."

Canon Boylan gave a most mature and learned lecture on Messianic Prophecy, tracing the development of the Messianic Hope through the history of Israel. He described how it dominates the thought of the Old Testament, and illustrated each of his points with apt citations from the Sacred Books.

Fr. Dyson followed the historical development of the concept of Wisdom, dealing competently with this comprehensive and difficult subject.

Fr. John Garvin, well known in England for his work on the motor missions to non-catholics, handled well the difficult subject of the moral problems arising from the conduct of the Hebrews. He distinguished the moral code from the actions of the Hebrews, which were not always in accordance with that code. He also showed how the religious character of Israel made their moral code superior to that of other peoples.

The complete lectures will appear later in book form, as the Summer School for 1938.

REV. DONALD COX, C. M.
Pontif. Bibl. Institute, Rome.

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL CORNER

In recent years, our metropolitan newspapers have been giving generous publicity to archaeological excavations in Bible lands. Not only are the discoveries promptly reported, but special efforts are made to get illustrated descriptions of them from the discoverer. Whatever the reasons may be, many people are fascinated with such reading, and editors feel that archaeological discoveries of a biblical nature have a real news value for the general public.

The student of Sacred Scripture, even more than the general reader, is attracted to archaeological matters by the very nature of his studies, and welcomes every discovery bearing upon the Book of Books. He does not rest satisfied, however, with the preliminary accounts in newspapers, but seeks the official reports and the subsequent discussions of scholars in archaeological and biblical journals. Discoveries need to be correlated and properly interpreted. It is one thing to uncover the bare facts, and quite another sometimes to understand their bearing and real meaning. As first interpretations are usually more or less conjectural, further studies general-

ly bring modifications and even new interpretations. Frequently it is necessary to await further discoveries for clarification.

The archaeologists themselves, who have been bearing the burden of the day and the heat, are a distinguished group, with linguistic and other technical equipment of a very high order, and all in all with a singular love for truth. No attempts at forgery have sullied their record in recent times. There is also noticeable among them a growing spirit of consultation and co-operation. They watch the progress of each others excavations, and discuss freely their mutual problems. They give proper credit when a problem has been solved, and are ungrudging in their praise of work well done. Evidently, no independence of view is sacrificed, for they criticize each other's publications fearlessly when they deem it necessary; in fact, the archaeologists have been their own best critics. From their practical experience in field work, they have developed a technique of procedure and recording which is truly scientific, and today the departments of antiquity in all countries where archaeological research is carried on, insist on high standards. Detailed reports and discussions with copious charts and photographic illustrations, make available the results of their labors to other scholars throughout the world.

What has archaeology actually accomplished as far as the Bible is concerned? Considerable, even though there have been comparatively few discoveries bearing directly on biblical persons and events. Perhaps its chief contribution thus far, has been the authentication of innumerable details in what may be called the cultural and historical background of biblical times. Just how convincing are the results, is evident from the decided change of attitude among many who were inclined to consider the Scriptures practically worthless as historical documents. Not so frequently is the charge now heard that the Scriptures are rather clumsy forgeries, which project into remote antiquity the conditions of later times. Archaeological evidence is steadily forcing concession after concession that at least as far as this background material is concerned, the Scriptures correctly picture the times described.

Regarding biblical chronology, some progress has been made, though rather slowly. Archaeology has been able to fix accurately a few dates here and there in the later biblical periods through synchronisms with astronomically ascertained dates in the adjacent lands. General indications regarding the earlier periods are also accumulating, but much remains to be done first in clearing up the dating of the early Egyptian and Assyrian dynasties. The evidence is still too disconnected to offer a solid basis for even a reasonably certain approximation. It will probably be the cumulative evidence of the whole Near East, which will finally begin to bring a glimmer of light on the problem. In the meantime, there is a commendable tendency, particularly among Palestinian archaeologists, to use the minimum chronology for a working hypothesis, and to make adjustments as the evidence warrants.

A relative chronology can be established without much difficulty at any site which has been more or less continuously occupied for centuries, by digging down through the tell or mound formed by the stratified ruins of the successive occupations. The upper levels are evidently later than those beneath, and the presence of an occasional dateable object in any level will help to fix more accurately the period to which the level belongs. When the relative sequence of clearly distinctive levels is found to be constant in numerous tells, reliable conclusions can be drawn regarding the succession of cultures in the region under investigation.

The archaeologist is dependent on what his spade may turn up, and that may be little enough in some of the levels of a Palestinian tell. Often-times, as he views his meager find, he may be tempted to quote Horace's "*parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.*" There have been some notable exceptions, and no tell has been an entire disappointment. Even though the discoveries have not been so sensational as those in Egypt, Assyria, or Persia, the information gained has been of considerable value in Near East history.

Palestine was the corridor between Egypt and the countries to the north and east. It was on the trade routes of great nations, and the line of march of conquering armies. Many times it became the battleground of the dictators of other days, who strove for the political and commercial mastery of the Orient. Again and again its cities, never very large, were quite thoroughly looted and burned. Like those before and after them, the Israelites under Josue also destroyed the cities which they conquered on entering the Promised Land, and the thoroughness of the destruction is still evident in numerous excavations. At the capture of Jericho, "they burned the city and all things that were therein; except the gold and silver, and vessels of brass (bronze) and iron, which they consecrated to the service of the Lord" (Josue 6:24). All the metals were considered valuable, and it was only accidentally that smaller pieces escaped the general plunder, to lie hidden for centuries in the debris and ultimately gladden the heart of some twentieth century archaeologist.

The perishable materials, such as wood, cloth, skins, papyrus, etc., if they survived at all the conflagration which generally followed the taking of a city, could not long withstand the torrential rains and the dampness of the climate. Only bricks, stone, plaster, and pottery remained in any appreciable quantities, along with an occasional object of metal. Pottery, in particular, looms large in the debris of most levels. Apparently, it was used for many purposes in every oriental household, and it varied in type, style, material, and workmanship from age to age. These broken sherds of common household utensils mean much to the archaeologist, and from the characteristic pottery of a level, he can frequently approximate the period to which the level belongs, and the type of culture and influences prevailing.

For want of a better terminology, archaeologists still speak of the stone, bronze, and iron ages, and divide each into early, middle, and late periods,

with further sub-divisions into numerous phases. The iron age in Palestine is generally set as beginning about 1200 B. C., although there are indications that iron was used at least a century earlier. Bronze, an alloy of copper and tin, was in general use before iron, but how early is not definitely known. The bronze age in Palestine was thought to have begun about 2000 B. C., but new evidence has pushed the date back to 2500 B. C., and now many would place it at 3000 B. C., or even earlier. Before the bronze age was a stone age, with an early period known as paleolithic, recognized by crude implements of unpolished stone, and a later period known as the neolithic, characterized by polished stone implements. Between the two would be placed a transitional period known as mesolithic.

As primitive copper and bronze objects have been found recently in what would otherwise be classified as late phases of neolithic, a new term, chalcolithic or aeneolithic (copper-stone), has been suggested to designate an apparent transition from neolithic to early bronze properly so-called. Several are inclined to believe that Palestine did not have a strictly neolithic period with only polished stone implements and no metal, but passed rapidly from the rough stone artifacts of the paleolithic, through a brief mesolithic with the first attempts at polished ware, directly into a chalcolithic period in which the polished stone industries developed simultaneously with the use of copper and other metals. In other words, man may have discovered the use of metals about the same time that he began to develop skill in polishing his stone and bone implements, and in making pottery. Be that as it may, the chalcolithic type deposits uncovered by the Jesuit Fathers at Teleilat el-Ghassul, and the recently unearthed lower levels of Jericho, Bethshan, and other sites in Palestine and Syria, have aroused some lively discussions among the archaeologists. Pere Vincent, O. P., whose archaeological articles in the *Revue Biblique* are always of interest and profit, is at present carefully appraising Garstang's conclusions concerning the lower levels of Jericho.

These early periods, chalcolithic, neolithic, mesolithic, bring us back to what are known as the proto-historical times, but Palestine has still more to offer. In recent years, its caves have become the happy hunting grounds of the pre-historian in search of paleolithic remains. A dozen or more Neanderthaloid types have been uncovered along with Mousterian type deposits, and there are hopes of more. It is interesting to note the number of Catholics who are engaged in this particular phase of archaeological research in various parts of the world. The present Arab-Jewish troubles in Palestine have interrupted practically all archaeological work there, but it will give the archaeologists and others interested, a breathing spell in which to evaluate and correlate the materials thus far uncovered.

E. A. CERNY.

BOOK REVIEWS

F. A. SPENCER, O. P., *The New Testament*. A new translation from the Original Greek, edited by Rev. Charles J. Callen, O. P., and Rev. John A. McHugh, O. P. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1937). Pp. XIV, 717. \$4.50.

The publication of this translation of the New Testament from the original Greek a year and a half ago was such an important event that even after such a lapse of time it is worthy of notice in the opening pages of the Catholic Biblical Review. Although received with acclaim by Biblical scholars of all denominations in the English-speaking world, the work does not seem to be as widely known as it merits.

The chief criterion to be used in judging the merit of a translation is the measure in which it reproduces (1) faithfully, (2) clearly, and (3) in a pleasing manner the thought of the original. For translation has been well likened to the pouring of honey from one receptacle into another, some of its sweetness always being lost in the process, and the degree in which the sweetness of the original is retained or lost may be taken as a gauge of the success of the operation.

Judged by this standard, the version of Father Spencer may be declared to be a work of a high degree of perfection. For it is based on a critical text in the original language of the autographs of the New Testament; it reproduces faithfully the mind of the writers; the language of the translation gives pleasure by its clearness, its dignity and its elegance. Moreover, the published form of the translation is such as should satisfy and even delight the taste of the most fastidious lover of good book-making.

In choosing the basis of his translation of the New Testament, Father Spencer selected a critical text in the Greek language used in the original documents. This gives his translation the advantage which comes from close contact with the thought as expressed by the sacred writers themselves. In this he placed himself in a more favorable position than the makers of the Rheims Testament, who based their work on the Latin Vulgate text. While the latter is recognized as a venerable text and regarded, on critical grounds, as equal in value to any of the oldest Greek codices of the N. T., having, moreover, the guarantee of its substantial accuracy through the Church, nevertheless, as a version, it comes between the language of the original writers and the reader. Every translation is to a certain extent an interpretation and looses somewhat in its effort to express what is said in the original language. Hence our Rheims version of the N. T. was at a double disadvantage from the start, since it was a translation of a translation, which itself was but a revision, by St. Jerome in the fourth century, of an older Latin translation. Moreover, the Vulgate text, which the makers of the Douay-Rheims version used, was far removed from the work produced by St. Jerome; it had suffered greatly in minor details from errors consciously or unconsciously introduced into it by its many transcribers.

While no substantial change may be expected to result from the revision of the Latin Vulgate, when the Pontifical Commission of Revision reaches that portion of the Bible, still the result will undoubtedly be a Latin text quite different in details from the Latin text underlying the Rheims N. T.

The science of textual criticism has progressed greatly within the last three centuries. Since the making of the Douay-Rheims Version, very many MSS. of the texts and versions, including three out of four of our oldest Greek codices, have been discovered. The Latin Vulgate Version remains on critical and theological grounds a document of the highest value; but its testimony, on critical grounds, is that of a single first-class witness. Consequently it was to be expected that modern scholars of the Church would make translations of the New Testament directly from a critical text in the original language into the vernaculars of today—French, Italian, German, Spanish, Dutch, Polish, and, as in the case of the Westminster Version, into the English language. It is fortunate for the reputation of American Catholic scholarship that, through Father Spencer, it can take credit for having made, even before the publication of the Westminster Version, a translation of the New Testament from a critical Greek text.

The text, adopted by Father Spencer, does not depend upon any particular critical edition. He did what is being done commonly by modern exegetes, because of the uncertainty of New Testament textual criticism in minor matters. Except in the case of those passages (e. g., Mk. 16:9-20), where Catholics are not free to choose, he has exercised an eclecticism, undoubtedly on the basis of great critical editions, to form the Greek text which underlies his translation. Wherever there is a notable difference between the Greek reading of the MSS. which he follows and those of other important Greek MSS., he calls attention to this fact in the notes. At the same time so great is his reverence for the Latin Vulgate that, whenever there is a marked difference between the best Greek readings and that of the Vulgate, he gives the latter either in brackets alongside the text or in a footnote. Moreover, he has diligently compared his readings with those of the Syriac, hoping by the added help of this ancient source to come as near as possible to the original reading of the sacred text.

The Greek text, chosen by Fr. Spencer as a basis for his work, does not differ substantially from that underlying the Latin Vulgate and the Rheims version. Nevertheless, in matters of detail, there are fundamental differences, which are of sufficient importance to be observed. Interesting specimens of renditions in Fr. Spencer's translation, resulting from his adoption of Greek readings other than those underlying the Latin Vulgate and Rheims text, are as follows: (a) Jn. 1:18, "only-begotten God" in place of "only-begotten Son"; (b) Jn. 6:70, "*Holy One of God*" in place of "*Son of God*." (c) In Jn. 19:34 the reading "*pierced*," *ἔρυσεν*, is almost unanimously supported by the Greek MSS. as against "*opened*," *ἤνοιξεν*, supposed by the reading of the Rheims version and Vulgate; (d) in Jn. 21:15-17, the reading, supposed by the translation of Father Spencer, has

(a second time) "my *sheep*," instead of "my *lambs*" as in the Rheims version, following the Vulgate. In these verses, not only the reading of the Vulgate and Rheims version is defective but the translation also fails to bring out the precise meaning expressed by Our Lord, who employed two different verbs, rightly rendered by Fr. Spencer: "*Feed*, (βόσκει,) my *lambs* (ἀρνία),," "*be a shepherd* (ποιμαίνει) to my *sheep* (πρόβατα),," "*feed* (βόσκει) my *sheep* (πρόβατα).," (e) The reading of 1 Cor. 15:51, supported by all the important Greek MSS. (except $\aleph$ and D) against the Old Latin and Hieronymian versions and followed by the Greek and Syrian Fathers, was adopted as Fr. Spencer's basic text. (f) 2 Thes. 2:13, the translation "*from the beginning*" follows the Greek reading, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, instead of, ἀπ' ἀρχῆν, underlying the Rheims "*first fruits*." (g) 2 Tim. 4:5. "Be sober" is missing from Fr. Spencer's translation, because there is no evidence in the Greek MSS that St. Paul gave such advice to Timothy. (h) 1 Jn. 5:7b-8a are retained by Fr. Spencer, because, as we are informed in a footnote, although "the majority of Catholic critics hold to-day that they were not part of the original text, on the other hand the arguments for the authenticity of the passage have such weight that it would not be safe to regard non-authenticity as established."

The above are only a few of the many instances where Fr. Spencer's translation has had the initial advantage of a critical Greek text over versions, made at a time when the science of textual criticism was not so well developed.

But even when a basic text is well established as corresponding with the original, there is the necessity of translating it correctly. Accuracy in conveying the sense of an original text to a version is not an easy task. How well Fr. Spencer has succeeded in this regard may be illustrated by pointing out some of the instances in which he has avoided some of the defective renditions of the Rheims version: (a) Lk. 3:13, Fr. Spencer's translation: "*exact*, πρᾶσσετε, no more than what is prescribed" is more in conformity with the spirit of John the Baptist than the Rheims rendition, "*Do nothing more* than that which is appointed to you." (b) Mk. 7:11, "If a man says to his father or mother, 'Whatever support thou mightest have had from me is now Korban, that is, vowed to God,'" is much clearer than "If a man shall say to his father or mother, Corban, (which is a gift,) whatsoever is from me, shall profit thee." (c) Mt. 6:28-29, "*life*" is an excellent translation of ἡλικία, and "*span*" is justifiable for πῆχυς. The latter word, however, would be better translated by "a small space of time," since a *temporal* reference seems to be required by the context and since the word may have a temporal significance. (d) Lk. 16:9, "Make for yourselves friends *by means of* (ἐκ) the *unrighteous mammon*," is preferable to "friends of the mammon of iniquity"; "so that when *it* shall fail" is better supported in the MSS. than "when *you* shall fail." (e) Jn. 8:25. According to Fr. Spencer, Jesus, in answer to the question of the Jews, "Who art thou," replied: "Even the same that I said to you from the beginning."

—a good rendering of the indisputable Greek text. The rendering of the Rheims Version following the Vulgate: "The beginning who also speaks unto you" is, to say the least, very forced since τὴν ἀρχήν of the original is in the *accusative* case and the pronoun following is in the neuter gender. (f) John 21:7. Fr. Spencer's translation of γυμνός by "stripped" very cleverly avoids the difficulty of knowing with certainty which of the two meanings, "naked" or "lightly clad," of the word was intended by the evangelist (cf. Jouon, *L'Evangile de N. S. J. C.*, p. 322). (g) Acts 2:27-31: Here Father Spencer is particularly felicitous in translating ᾧδης by "*the abode of the dead.*" For this Greek word can signify either the underworld (Cf. Lk. 16:23) or the grave. In the context of the Hebrew, quoted in Acts 2:27-31, according to the LXX, it would seem from the parallel line that it is the "grave" which is here spoken of. But in the Rheims version the word is translated as referring to the underworld of spirits, namely "Hell." Fr. Spencer's translation avoids the difficulty and gives at the same time the sense of the original. (h) Rom. 5:12: "*inasmuch as* all have sinned" is, to say the least, preferable to "*in whom* all have sinned." (i) Phil. 3:20: "*Our commonwealth* is in heaven" expresses a meaning of the Greek, while the Rheims translation, "our conversation is in heaven" does not correspond to it at all. (j) In concluding this list, showing the accuracy of Fr. Spencer's renderings, lest the reviewer be suspected of partiality, he would call attention to a translation of Fr. Spencer at variance with the sense of the Greek text. In 1 Thess. 4:4, his translation of σκεύος κτᾶσθαι makes St. Paul advise the Thessalonians: "that each of you should know how to *acquire* for himself a wife of his own." This translation, in the opinion of the reviewer, has not sufficient basis in Greek usage to make it certain and does not accord with the context as well as does the Rheims translation "*to possess his vessel* (i. e. his *body*) in sanctification." (But cf. Vosté, *Comm. in Thess.* in 1.)

The above specimens of the authenticity of the Greek text used and of the accuracy of the translation of Fr. Spencer have been given at considerable length because the readers of a scientific Biblical Review in judging the value of a book of translation give more weight to testimony of this kind than to that concerning its purely literary qualities. The evidence of the high quality of its language, style and other purely literary characteristics are more readily at the command of the interested reader. The language is at once recognized to be of the modern vernacular, dignified without being pedantic, intelligible without being vulgar, in accord with its lofty theme. Obsolete terms are avoided. The Hebrew spelling of O. T. Hebrew names, like Elijah, Elisha, and Isaiah, is used instead of Elias, Eliseus, Isaias, to which we are accustomed. A tendency to reproduce words of Greek origin like "energy" for "working," "scandalize" for "offend," likewise a preference at times for words of Latin origin over words of Anglo-Saxon derivation may not be pleasing to every reader; but their use is restrained and does not interfere with the general impression from the reading of the text that

one is under the spell of the English, which has been made classic and almost standard by the Authorized and Revised Versions.

Of the pleasing literary qualities of Fr. Spencer's work, it is not possible to give here lengthy specimens. Let the reader open the book at random and he will find ample evidence of the clearness, dignity, and elegance of its style. If he wishes to have material for a comparative evaluation of the translation from the viewpoint of literary excellence, let him turn to any of the sections of the New Testament which are used in the Church's liturgy and frequently read in English to the faithful on Sundays and feast-days; he will be readily convinced of the superiority of this new English version.

The translation itself is elucidated by the paragraphing, by the division of the text into natural selections without resort to the traditional verse divisions, by appropriate headings over each section, by the use of quotation marks, when necessary, and the printing of the words of Our Lord Himself in special type. The notes are more than twice as numerous as those in our current Rheims-Challoner version and are sufficient to satisfy the difficulties that may occur to the average reader. As Fr. Spencer did not live to write the general and particular introduction, these, as well as many of the notes, have been supplied by the Editors, the Very Rev. Fathers Callan and McHugh, well known masters not only of theological science but also of literary art. The whole work in manuscript was gone over by the Very Rev. Fr. Vosté, O.P., Professor of N. T. Exegesis at the Angelicum, Rome, and Consultor to the Biblical Commission, and by the Very Rev. Thomas Garde, O.P., formerly Professor of O. T. Exegesis at the Collegio Angelico. Thus, five scholars of eminent authority have collaborated in the making of this new translation and afford a guarantee of its theological and literary excellence.

This new version, consequently, judged by the standards of the quality of basic text used, of accuracy of the translation of its message, of clearness and elegance of its literary style may be esteemed as of the highest quality.

EDWARD J. BYRNE.

W. R. RUSSELL, *Christ the Leader* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1938; second printing). \$2.00.

A Gospel fact for the moving picture of the imagination is the first principle that Dr. Russell of the Catholic University lays down as part of his method. These mental scenes the author draws from the text of the Gospel itself, as the very chapter titles bear witness. In a life of Christ, Christians realize at once what is meant by: "A Quiet Boyhood," "He is Coming: Make Ready," "Choosing Men to Spread the Kingdom," "That They May Have Life." So Dr. Russell pursues his way of flashing a Gospel view before his reader's mind. He writes this life that the young may rally round their true Leader, Christ Our Lord.

Yet facts without principles would be relatively barren. Dr. Russell explains in each chapter the principle involved in the narrative selected.

Having written for Catholic youth in the upper years of high school and early years of college, the author takes for granted an elementary knowledge of Christian beliefs, ideals and aims; but he works these out from the Gospel and its central figure, Our Saviour. That is the second point in his method. He quite rightly avoids technical questions of authenticity and credibility, except as *obiter dicta* incident to the scenes themselves.

Practical, however, not merely theoretical or pictorial, is his real purpose. And so each chapter of the sixty-four applies the Christian principles to 20th century life as that is lived by boys and girls, young men and women to-day. His method spans the centuries, making Christ walk now in the midst of modern problems as He once walked in Judaea, Samaria and Galilee. Carefully Dr. Russell points out how Christ would deal with facts to-day.

That the author has achieved his aim in the "attempt to portray His life as a dynamo which sends out energy for Christ-like living" (vi), I believe to be a fact.

The original drawing of Christ in the frontispiece, simple, majestic, commanding, tenderly inviting with His right hand extended, should do a great deal to impress young readers favorably. The relief map of Palestine inside the front cover will help clear up such expressions as going *down* from Jerusalem to Jericho, when the latter is almost east of David's city. The plan of ancient Jerusalem, unencumbered with too much detail, should prove very serviceable indeed.

Dr. Russell chose wisely in following the order of the late Father Lagrange's *Synopse*, in the main. Exegetes may differ as to some of his interpretations (pp. 21-22). Theologians may look for more stress on the Mystical Body. In touching on original sin, Dr. Russell resorts to popular instead of strict theological language, which in a book of this scope should cause no difficulty (p. 15), but he shows a competent theological hand throughout.

A most useful, indeed, a necessary book is this of its kind. "Omnia instaurare in Christo" might well have been its subtitle. Just this the book accomplishes in no small measure.

J. L. BAZINET.

The New Testament. Papers read at the Cambridge Summer School of Catholic Studies, July 31 to August 9, 1937 (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1938). Pp. XI, 344.

The Summer School of Catholic Studies has made, over these past 17 years, a distinct contribution to our literature on Catholic academic subjects. The present volume is the second which deals with the Scriptures, the first *Religion and the Scriptures*, being now in its third edition. There is great room for such additions to our biblical literature, and it is a pleasure to welcome a work of this nature, with a scholarly background and yet within the reach of the average layman interested in the subject. *The New Testament* might be described as an introduction to the New Testament, and as such fills creditably a need long felt.

The lectures of which the volume is composed run rather completely—at least in the selection of subjects—through the fields of General and Special Introduction as these affect the New Testament. Some of the lectures are devoted to the Canon and Versions, the Text, the Apocrypha, and phases of Hermeneutics; others deal with the Roman and Jewish Backgrounds of the New Testament, the stories of Sts. Peter, Paul and John, the Synoptic and Johannine questions, the Parables. Although this list does not exhaust the possibilities of Introduction, it obviously covers a wide field and offers a rich fund of information to those who would know and understand the New Testament better. Further, although the lectures themselves are not complete treatises on their subjects, they are adequate to the needs envisioned by the Summer School, and enjoy the advantage of being pronounced by men thoroughly familiar with biblical studies.

Under the circumstances out of which the volume rises we do not look for exhaustive discussions of the elected topics, nor should we expect the presentation of new theories or the final settlement of long disputed questions. In fact the lecturers have done admirably well in stating so clearly their thoughts on such wide subjects within the allotted space. There is, moreover, something stimulating and provocative in the handling of the subjects which should lead, as the sponsors of the School probably hope, to further reading and study. To encourage this further investigation, the authors, in some instances, provide a brief bibliography which, unfortunately, is not often either Catholic or English.

The volume is not intended for those professed in biblical sciences, although even the scholar will find it of great interest even when he cannot agree with all its opinions. The circumstances have at times occasioned a brevity which will be found unsatisfactory to the scholar. This is of necessity the case with the solution offered for the Synoptic Question. It might also occur to some that the Parables are made to look a bit more simple than they are usually found by the exegete. Some also will question the advice (pp. 322 ff.) which encourages a knowledge of Greek for the inexpert reader of the New Testament, but which considers a knowledge of the norms of interpretation not a prime necessity. Mention might have been made in some instances, where other good opinions exist, that the view expressed is open to discussion, as (p. 115) that there is some doubt whether the "other disciple" in Jn. 18:15 is John the Apostle.

But these limitations, if under the circumstances they may be considered such, will not interfere with the essential value of the lectures, or prevent them from leading to a better appreciation of the New Testament. The priest and seminarian also will find the volume a means of freshening their biblical studies. The good effect of the Summer School would be greatly extended if this contribution were employed as a text-book for New Testament Introduction in some of our higher schools.

W. L. NEWTON.

LEO VAGANAY, *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Translated by Rev. B. V. Miller, D. D. (London: Sands and Co., 1937). Pp. 208. 3s. 6d.

Professor Vaganay of the Theological Faculty of Lyons has provided a handy manual on Textual Criticism for students, particularly welcome to Catholics. The author's competence, clear presentation and easy style make the book interesting reading. The material he has divided into five chapters. The Sources; The Method of Textual Criticism; The History of the Written Text; The History of the Printed Text; Some Examples for Beginners. A few points may be mentioned.

Establishing the true method of criticism Vaganay rejects Lachmann's system of common faults and Dom Quentin's "iron rule" and defends an eclectic method, combining external and internal criticism, the latter not being subjective, but, as Père Lagrange calls it, rational criticism (p. 89).

The importance of the Western text is emphasized. It is really not Western but universal, very ancient, not homogeneous but existing in different types in different places (Europe, Africa, Egypt, Syria, Palestine p. 117). "In our opinion it may be identified with the current primitive text that, at an early date..., began to undergo alterations" (p. 118). Instead of contradicting this theory the Chester Beatty papyrus "with its mixed forms may well represent the Egyptian text at the time when the revisers began methodically to set to work upon it" (p. 120).

For the future the tasks are: the history of the great recensions; a thorough study of the Western text; further studies on Tatian's *Diatesseron*; the classification of early variants according to geographical diffusion—these are some of the preliminary tasks. Ardently desired is the new edition of Tischendorf, projected as an international enterprise, but unfortunately suspended over a decade ago. The final pages (185-192) describing work still undone may point out many fields for Doctorate work.

In a second edition the author can treat the Egerton papyri and the Rylands fragment of St. John's Gospel. An interesting, well written book.

JOHN J. COLLINS, S. J.

DOM HUBERT VAN ZELLER, *Watch and Pray* (The last six Minor Prophets) and *Isaías: Man of Ideas* (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1937 and 1938. Pp. XI, 119 and XII, 123. 5s. and 3s. 6d. respectively).

In the above-named volumes Dom Van Zeller continues the series of essays, begun a few years ago, on Old Testament characters. The studies, presented therein, do not pretend to be scientific scriptural treatises. As the title of the first, listed above, suggests, they are books for meditations on Old Testament subjects and have been written with the hope that people "by seeing how very nearly the Sacred writers resemble ourselves (and how much more nearly we resemble those for whom they wrote) we shall perhaps feel less inclined to leave their works alone" and that some of the

"readers will find themselves drawn to making their Preparations and Thanksgivings for Holy Communions from some of the Prophets."

In a preliminary volume, entitled "Prophets and Princes" and published two years ago, Dom Van Zeller sketched in picturesque manner the character and times of leading Israelitic personages of political and religious importance from Heli to Ezechias. In this work there was depicted the general background of the times in which the Prophets, subsequently described, are seen to move. A deep religious sense of the significance of the history of Israel in God's providential plan is accompanied at times by a subtle humor. Perhaps it is the latter which explains that the figure of Solomon in all his glory is not included in the number of the great ones of Israel to whom separate chapters are devoted; for it may be that, according to Fr. Van Zeller's standards, the mighty Solomon, notwithstanding his wealth and wisdom and large number of wives, did not, in the working out of God's designs, amount to much.

The preliminary volume has been followed by three others in quick succession. The first two, entitled respectively "Sackcloth and Ashes" and "Watch and Pray," deal with the personalities and activities of the so-called Minor Prophets; the third volume, recently published, is built around "Isaias, Man of Ideas." The whole series forms a most attractive introduction to the history and religious significance of this section of the Old Testament, largely unknown to a great many.

The Hebrew Prophets were unquestionably among the most important figures in the pre-Christian religious history of mankind. They were God's privileged agents in moulding the thought and life of their age. They influenced powerfully the course of events in the history of Israel. When one considers the condition of the ancient Orient and of the Hebrew nation, as made known by the sacred narratives and by modern research, he cannot but increase his wonder, when he reads the Books of the Prophets of Israel. That men, gifted with such religious vision and with such marvelous literary skill, should have arisen out of conditions so sordid has no other rational explanation than that of a special Divine intervention through them in the affairs of Israel and of the human race. Neither in the life of the Hebrews themselves nor of the surrounding nations was there any external influence that could have naturally produced the message of the Hebrew Prophets.

Dom Van Zeller has merited well of all right-minded persons by producing these alluring studies of the significance of the Prophets in the history of Israel and of humanity. Even those who have never studied the writings of the Prophets may be led by his pleasing introduction to take up the investigation of them seriously.

The author does not of course deal professedly and in a formal way with such critical questions as that of the authorship, date, literary unity of the prophetical writings. He adopts the traditional opinions on these matters. He takes the prophetical writings as they are and, looking at them in

the light of their times, causes the reader to see how full they are of meaning and of religious value, even for us of to-day.

At the present time, when in sections of the Christian world, where formerly the Scriptures were elevated to a position for which they were never intended, there are now strenuous efforts to discard and cast them onto the rubbish heap, it is particularly pleasing to have the assurance, afforded by the hearty welcome, given to Dom Van Zeller's volumes, that the literature of the Old Testament continues to have a deep interest for right-minded persons.

The essays of Dom Van Zeller have their lessons for our day. The proof, which the teaching of the Prophets, so attractively set forth in them, affords of the fact of the All-Ruling Providence, presiding over the affairs of the world and bringing good out of evil in His own good time, is helpful for the present generation whose patience and confidence in God are being put to a test. "O soul," says Dom Van Zeller, "would be the advice of Isaias to him who would force the pace of God, remember the centuries that the eyes of God have seen. Recall the generations that are yet to come. Be still, there is plenty of time. Look at life, O soul,—your life and the life of mankind at large—through the eyes of God. God's plans frustrated? Oh no! only a long time being realized!"

EDWARD J. BYRNE.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Some of these may be reviewed in subsequent issues.)

Sheed & Ward, New York City, N. Y.:

Introduction to Scripture. By THOMAS MORAN. 1938. Pp. 188. \$2.00.
Once—in Palestine. By LUCILLE PAPIN BORDEN. 1938. Pp. 177. \$1.50.

Macmillan Company, New York City, N. Y.:

The New Testament. A New translation from the Original Greek. By the Very Rev. F. A. SPENCER. Edited by Charles J. Callan, O. P. and John A. McHugh, O. P. 1937. Pp. XIV, 717. \$4.50.

The Liturgy of the Church. By DOM VIRGIL MICHEL. 1937. Pp. VIII, 369. \$2.50.

Pius XI Apostle of Peace. By LILLIAN BROWNE-OLF. 1938. Pp. XIV, 257. \$2.50.

Three Theories of Society. By PAUL HANLY FURFEY. 1937. Pp. X, 251. \$2.00.

Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. By FULTON J. SHEEN. 1938. Pp. XIII, 187. \$2.00.

Charles Scribner's Sons, 597 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.:

The Degrees of Knowledge. By JACQUES MARITAIN. 1938. Pp. XVIII, 475. \$6.00.

The Unity of Philosophical Experience. By ETIENNE GILSON. 1937. Pp. XII, 330. \$2.75.

Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages. By ETIENNE GILSON. 1938. Pp. VII, 114. \$1.50.

Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin:

The Church of Christ. By REV. A. ROUSSEAU. 1936. Pp. XIV, 313. \$2.00.

Social Message of the N. T. By REV. H. SCHUMACHER, D. D. 1937. Pp. XVIII, 228. \$2.00.

Christ, The Leader. By W. H. RUSSELL. 1938 (Second Edition). Pp. 472. \$2.00.

The World's Classic, Job. By REV. GEORGE O'NEILL, S. J. Pp. XIII, 158. \$2.75.

The Whole Christ. By EMILE MERSCH, S. J. Translated by John R. Kelly, S. J. 1938. Pp. XVI, 623. \$5.00.

Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., London, England:

Witnesses to Christ. By MOST REV. ALBAN GOODIER, S. J. 1938. Pp. 164. \$2.25.

The New Testament. Papers Read at the Summer School of Catholic Studies, held at Cambridge, July 31 to August 9, 1937. Preface by Rev. C. Lattey, S. J. 1938. Pp. XI, 344. 7s. 6d.

Isaias. By HUBERT VAN ZELLER, O. S. B. 1938. Pp. 123. 3s. 6d.

Watch and Pray. By HUBERT VAN ZELLER, O. S. B. 1937. Pp. XI, 119. 5s.

The Gospel of Jesus Christ (Vol. I). By PERE M. J. LAGRANGE, O. P. 1938. Pp. 320. 10s. 6d.

George Coldwell, Ltd., London, England:

The Salvation of the Nations. By HERMANN FRANKE. Translated from the German by Canon George Smith, D. D. Preface by Karl Adam. 1938. Pp. VIII, 142. 4s.

Sands & Company, London, England:

An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. By LEO VAGANAY. Translated from the French by Rev. B. V. Miller, D. D. 1937. Pp. 208.

J. H. Furst Company, Baltimore, Maryland:

Firstborn of Every Creature (Col. 1, 15). A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of St. Mary's University, Baltimore, Maryland, in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology. By EDWARD AUGUSTINE CERNY, S. S. Pp. VII, 90.

The Abbey Press, St. Meinrad, Indiana:

Rome and the Study of Scripture. A Collection of Papal Enactments on the Study of Holy Scripture together with the Decisions of the Biblical Commission. 1937. Pp. 84. \$.30.

Hebrew Publishing Company, New York City, N. Y.:

And It Came to Pass. By HAYYIM NAHMAN BIALIK. 1938. Pp. 281. \$.30.

Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Indiana:

The Life of Jesus. (With an Outline for Study Clubs) 1938. Pp. 183. \$1.00.

Columbia College Press, Dubuque, Iowa:

The Fine Gold of the Old Testament. By REV. I. J. SEMPER. 1938. Pp. XVIII, 284. \$1.00.